Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

RESERVE
A249.3
F763

CLASSIFICATION IN A NEW DECADE

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
JAN 4 - 1961
U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE

Report of the

1st Classification Seminar
Ogden, Utah

NOV. 30 - DEC. 5, 1959

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Washington 25, D. C.

To: Regional Foresters and Directors **File No.** 6140

From: C. K. Lyman, Director **Date:** October 12, 1960
Division of Personnel Management, By

Subject: Classification

Enclosed are your copies of "Classification in a New Decade" - the report of the Servicewide seminar for classification and wage specialists and officers, which was held at Ogden, Utah, on November 30 - December 5, 1959.

Certain portions were required to be re-typed outside the Forest Service to facilitate reproduction. Several errors and omissions apparently crept into the copy in that process. The enclosed correction sheet covers only those corrections required to keep the original sense.

For the recording and compiling of the voluminous results of the five-day seminar we are indebted to Dave Mooney, who served as general chairman for reporting; to the five individuals who provided strong support through serving as daily reports coordinators; and to the corps of individual reporters who served as topical reporters. The draft was given a final review and editing in this office for general policy and content.

Dave Mooney and the Southern Station also arranged for and followed through on the contracting with other agencies for the reproduction job. We are sure that we speak for all the Service when we compliment Mr. Mooney and the Southern Station for a splendid job. The Station has informed us that the printer retained several copies of the report - as "an outstanding example of a good meeting and report."

Individual follow-up actions required by the report will be the subject of separate letters.

Enclosures

K. M. Daniels

214

CORRECTION SHEET

"CLASSIFICATION IN A NEW DECADE"

Page	Line	Change
Page 22	Line 22	Delete "by" to read "covered permissively"
Page 23	Line 5	Change "latest" to "later"
Page 23	Line 12, 14	Delete "Of four ...senior" Write in: Of these, four are now Regional classification officers, three have returned to Forestry positions, one has returned to his previous agency, and the others occupy responsible"
Page 23	Line 30	Column under "GS-11, Delete 30, substitute 24.
Page 25	Line 29	After "replacement activities" change period to colon
Page 26		After title, insert: Digest
Page 26	Line 11, 12	Change "elected" to "elicited", delete for the classifier."
Page 26	Line 17, 18	Delete "where" after "transfers" insert "are possible".
Page 41		After title insert: Digest
Page 50	Line 12	After "point", change comma to period
Page 62	Line 24	After "chief"s office" delete "is required to" to read "the chief's office consolidates".
Page 87	Line 12	After "Nutshell" delete "is" and substitute "may be".

214

FOREWORD

This report of proceedings at the Classification Seminar, held at Ogden, Utah, on November 30 - December 5, 1959, contains most major papers and addresses in their entirety. Panel presentations and discussions are presented in digest form. Introductory material includes the seminar program, listing and photograph of participants, and acknowledgments.

The seminar type of conference does not lead to group recommendations and conclusions, but topic presentations and discussions containing or requesting policy and procedural guidance have been carefully edited to retain those features. Detailed procedural outlines were made available to all participants as handout material. A complete listing of handout material is contained in the appendix.

The obligation for improved public service was accepted and recognized enthusiastically by seminar members. Participation was general and active in all sessions and results were stimulating. This was truly an enriching educational experience. Appreciation for the privilege of attendance at this seminar is expressed here and will be proven by program improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD. i

TABLE OF CONTENTS. ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

FINAL PLANS AND AGENDA 1

LIST OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS. 7

PICTURE OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

INTRODUCTION AND PROGRAM INFORMATION 8

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS 9
Floyd Iverson 9
Reed Bailey. 10

THE JOB AHEAD IN CLASSIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT 11

COMMUNICATION IN THE FOREST SERVICE 13

A CAREER PLAN FOR FOREST SERVICE POSITION CLASSIFIERS 19

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY 27

LESS PAPERWORK IN POSITION CLASSIFICATION. 33

DELEGATION OF CLASSIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY BELOW REGION AND STATION LEVELS 36

IMPROVING CLASSIFIER RELATIONSHIP WITH MANAGEMENT . . . 37

SALARY AND WAGE ADMINISTRATION 41

HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME 42

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION AND PAY TRENDS 47

HOW TO GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE 49

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS AND TRENDS IN RECENT AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS 50

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION INSPECTIONS AND AUDITS. 52

OBJECTIVES, PROCEDURES, AND REWARDS OF AUDIT PROGRAM 54

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION PRACTICES AND PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS 59

POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS - THEIR INTERPRETATION, USE AND CONTINUOUS REVISION 61

I. Introduction to the Topic: The Standards Job at the Bureau Level 61
II. The Interpretation of Classification Standards 64
III. Position Classification Standards Application of the GS-456-0 Series 70
IV. Position Classification Standards Application of the GS-201-0 Series 73
V. Position Classification Standards Application of the GS-312-0 and GS-322-0 Series 74
VI. Supervisory Grade Evaluation Guide - Part I 76
VII. Guide Lines for Review of Tentative Standards 77

SECURITY IN INDUSTRY 82

KEY PROBLEM AREAS OF SERVICEWIDE INTEREST 83

TWO PROFILES IN ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP. 89

IMPRESSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE 91

FIELD TRIP 92

APPENDIX 93

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Division of Personnel Management, Intermountain Region, and the Division of Station Management, Intermoutain Forest and Range Experiment Station served as excellent hosts. Regional Forester Floyd Iverson and Station Director Reed Bailey are to be commended for the gracious and efficient contribution of their respective staffs in planning of arrangements for hotel and facilitating services and for clerical and refreshment services.

Seminar participation by such outstanding personnel management people as J. P. Findlay of the Department of Agriculture, Clark Stohl and William Haslam of the 10th Civil Service Region, Samuel Allan of the Bureau of Land Management Area Office in Salt Lake City, Leslie Norton of Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, ensured broad coverage of major program aspects. Need for constant awareness of over-all personnel and management implications of classification work was key-noted by Chalmer K. Lyman, Director of the Division of Personnel Management.

The luncheon speakers gave freely of their time and talents to present topics of interest to the seminar groups. Dr. Wendell Keck, Mr. Richard Maycock, Mr. Dave Troupe,and Dr. J. D. Williams gave inspiring and refreshing speeches.

The report chairman, David Mooney, the daily report coordinators, Robert Bain, Raymond Bell, Rupert Mulchaey, Dewell Bradfield,and Samuel Kistler, and the individual topic reporters, Lyman Hicks, Walter Mann, Franklin Salzman, Gordon Hutton, Neil Opsal, Helen Scudder, Leslie Kent, Milton Ray, Lela Vaughan, Mary Maxwell, Wallace Otterson, Roman Pfeffer, Gordon Arrowood, Raymond Emig, Frank Casanova, Darwin Hendricks, Charles Petersen, Ernest Harris, Harry Halvorson, Richard Strasbaugh, Arlene Martin, Betty Peschek, Rolland Goodell,and Georgia Sherman, are deserving of special praise for their fast and efficient efforts in recording and compiling the large volume of material presented.

No acknowledgment of contributions would be complete without an expression of appreciation to Perry B. Hinkelman and his staff who provided leadership and stimulated an atmosphere which made this gathering a true seminar-- "a voyage of discovery". Evidences of the many hours of advance preparation and planning were exhibited by all participants in the seminar.

FINAL PLANS AND AGENDA

Theme. Classification in a New Decade.

Objectives. To stimulate creative thinking and the application of trained judgment in (1) clarifying the essential current requirements for classification programs, (2) identifying the most important principles, philosophies, and approaches in achieving classification objectives, and (3) planning for consistent interpretation of such principles through improved techniques.

Methods. To assure maximum participation for all individuals attending the seminar, plans have been made for a variety of conference methods, including panels, work groups, prepared problem analyses, case studies, and standards charts. In addition to individual planning that has been made with groups and individuals who will present portions of the subject matter, all attending the seminar are expected and encouraged to participate in discussion periods through constructive comments and suggestions.

Framework of the Seminar. The framework will be set by Mr. Lyman's keynote address on classification and management.

Time Schedule. Five full days of seminar and conference sessions are planned, with optional attendance at a field trip on Saturday. The first day's schedule is set for 8:00 to 4:30. All other daily schedules are for 8:30 to 4:30. Two three-hour sessions daily will be devoted to seminar topics. Appropriate 10-minute breaks will be taken in each session, though they are not shown on the schedule. Daily luncheon sessions are scheduled for 11:30 to 1:30, when the group will meet at selected restaurants to hear scheduled speakers.

Visiting Classification Leaders. Current trends and philosophies will be discussed by Mr. Clark Stohl and Mr. William Haslam of the Civil Service Commission's Tenth Region and by Mr. Joseph Findlay, Chief, Program and Standards Division, Office of Personnel, Department of Agriculture.

Special Daily Luncheon Meetings. A new feature this year is a daily luncheon meeting, in which topics of general interest and professional importance will be presented by guest speakers who were chosen for their speaking ability. Our invitations have been accepted by Dr. J. D. Williams of the University of Utah Institute of Government; Mr. Richard Maycock, Manager of the Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institute of Salt Lake; Mr. David Troupe, Facilities Security Officer, Marquardt Corporation, Ogden; and Dr. Wendell Keck of the Intermoutain Station.

Exhibits and Materials. Each unit attending the seminar has been requested in previous correspondence to set up exhibits of work or programs of that region and station. Washington Office materials and exhibits for the seminar have been forwarded to Region 4 and marked to be held for the seminar. We suggest that others follow this practice if you have not already done so. All such material should be carefully labeled and packaged to facilitate location and arrangement of materials.

Show-Me Trip. This trip will consist of a visit to either Alta or Brighton recreation areas. Our last communication from Ogden indicates that a large number of our people will attend. Your arrangements for this trip should be confirmed with Region 4 if this has not already been done.

Reservations. We assume that all participants have made hotel reservations at Ogden. If any have not done so, they should deal directly with the region or the station or the local hotel on this matter.

Reporting Procedure. To equalize the reporting burden more equitably than has been done in the past, we have outlined a new plan in our letter of November 16. Individual reporters have been selected for each of the 25 items and sub-topics of the seminar. Reporting for each day will be the responsibility of five designated coordinators. The daily seminar reports will be collated and organized into a complete seminar report by a general reporting coordinator. We have already asked Mr. David Mooney of Southern Station to serve in the general coordinating capacity.

Arrivals. All participants should arrive in time to be prepared to work the full day beginning at 8:00 on Monday. We hope that all of you will arrive in Ogden no later than Sunday evening. Messrs. Hinkelman, Shull, Salzman, and Pfeffer and Miss Martin of the Washington Staff will arrive on Saturday evening. Mrs. Rasmussen, Mrs. Sherman, and Messrs. Lyman and Opsal will arrive on Sunday evening. All of the Washington Office group will be available, upon their arrival, for consultation or discussions concerning final arrangements. They may be reached at the Hotel Ben Lomond or the Forest Service building.

Banquet. The banquet, scheduled for Friday evening, is being planned by a special Washington-field committee. All seminar participants together with Region and Station staffs are invited to attend.

Business Management. Arlene Martin, Washington Office, will serve as business manager for collection of assessments, course materials, and for all business arrangements for the seminar.

U. S. Forest Service
AGENDA - POSITION CLASSIFICATION SEMINAR
November 30 to December 5, 1959
Conference Room - 2nd Floor - Forest Service Building
Ogden, Utah

Seminar Theme: POSITION CLASSIFICATION IN A NEW DECADE

Monday, November 30

MORNING SESSION

8:00 A. M.	1.	Registration
8:30 A. M.	2.	Introduction and Program Information (Mr. Hinkelman)
9:00 A. M.	3.	Welcome by Joint Hosts Floyd Iverson, Regional Forester Reed Bailey, Station Director
10:00 A. M.	4.	Keynote Address: Classification and Management Chalmer K. Lyman, Director, Personnel Management

LUNCHEON SESSION - Mansion House

11:30 A. M.	5.	Communication in the Forest Service Dr. Wendell M. Keck, Intermountain Station

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P. M.	6.	Staffing and Career Patterns for Forest Service Position Classifiers
3:30 P. M.	7.	Distribution of Classification Responsibility
4:30 P. M.		Adjourn

Tuesday, December 1

MORNING SESSION

8:30 A. M.	8.	Less Paperwork in Position Classification
10:30 A. M.	9.	Delegation of Classification Responsibility and Authority below Region and Station level

LUNCHEON SESSION - Rigo's

11:30 A. M.	10.	Improving Classifier Relationships with Management Mr. Clark Stohl, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P. M.	11.	Salary and Wage Administration
4:30 P. M.		Adjourn

Wednesday, December 2

MORNING SESSION

8:30 A. M.	12.	Hours of Work and Overtime
10:30 A. M.	13.	Current Classification and Pay Trends Mr. J. P. Findlay, Chief, Programs and Standards, Office of Personnel

LUNCHEON SESSION - Hotel Ben Lomond

11:30 A. M.	14.	Knowing Your People Mr. Richard W. Maycock, Manager, Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institute, Salt Lake City

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P. M.	15.	Significant Findings and Trends in Recent Audits and Inspections
2:00 P. M.	16.	CSC Inspections and Audits Mr. William Haslam, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Denver
3:00 P. M.	17.	Audit Program - Objectives, Procedures, and Rewards
4:00 P. M.	18.	Current Classification Practices and Procedural Requirements
4:30 P. M.		Adjourn

Thursday, December 3

MORNING SESSION

8:30 A. M.	19.	Position Classification Standards a. Interpretation
9:30 A. M.		b. Application: GS-456-0 Series
10:30 A. M.		GS-201-0 Series - Part II

LUNCHEON SESSION - Mansion House

11:30 A. M.	20.	Security in Industry Mr. Dave Troupe, Security Officer, Marquardt Corporation, Ogden

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P. M.	19. b. (Continued)	GS-312-0 and GS-322-0
2:15 P. M.		Supervisory Guide, Part I
3:15 P. M.	c. Guide Lines for Review of Tentative Standards	
4:30 P. M.	Adjourn	

Friday, December 4

MORNING SESSION

8:30 A. M.	21.	Key Problems Areas of Servicewide Interest

LUNCHEON SESSION - Hotel Ben Lomond

11:30 A. M.	22.	Administrative Qualitites Desirable in Leaders Dr. J. D. Williams, Institute of Government, University of Utah

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P. M.	23.	Impressions of the Conference Mr. Arnold Standing, Personnel Officer, Region 4 Mr. George Craddock, Chief, Division of Station Management, Intermountain Station Mr. Perry B. Hinkelman, Chief, Branch of Classification, Personnel Management Division, Washington Office
4:30 P. M.	Seminar Adjourned	
7:00 P. M.	Banquet - Canton Cafe	

Saturday, December 5 (Optional Attendance)

(Time to be announced)	24.	Field Trip - Alta or Brighton Recreation Area

CLASSIFICATION SEMINAR
Ogden, Utah
November 30 - December 5
1959

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Washington Office

Perry B. Hindelman
Mildred Rasmussen
Ralph Shull
Georgia Sherman
Franklin Salzman
Neil Opsal
Roman Pfeffer
Arlene Martin

Stations

Central States - Rupert Mulchaey
Intermountain - George Craddock
Intermountain - Walter Mann
Intermountain - Roy Maughan
Northeastern - Robert Bain
Pacific N. W. - Samuel Kistler
Southern - David Mooney
Southeastern - Raymond Bell
Southeastern - Gordon Arrowood
Pacific S. W. - Charles Petersen
Rocky Mountain - Dewell Bradfield
Forest Products Laboratory - Richard Strasbaugh

Regions

Region 1 - Charles George
Region 1 - Wallace Otterson
Region 2 - Darwin Hendricks
Region 3 - Rolland Goodell
Region 3 - Donald Flohr
Region 4 - Arnold Standing
Region 4 - J. William West
Region 4 - Lyman Hicks
Region 4 - Gordon Hutton
Region 5 - Warren Tracy
Region 5 - Lela Vaughan
Region 5 - Alvin Gammon
Region 6 - Ernest Harris
Region 6 - Mary Maxwell
Region 6 - Raymond Emig
Region 7 - Frank Casanova
Region 8 - Milton Ray
Region 9 - Harry Halvorson
Region 9 - Leslie Kent
Region 9 - Betty Peschek
Region 10 - Helen Scudder

GUEST SPEAKERS

Programs

Mr. Floyd Iverson, Regional Forester, Region 4
Mr. Reed Bailey, Intermountain Station
Mr. Chalmer K. Lyman, Director, Division of Personnel Management, U. S. Forest Service
Mr. Joseph P. Findlay, Office of Personnel, U. S. Department of Agriculture
Mr. William Haslam, Assistant Chief, Inspection and Classification Division, 10th U. S. Civil Service Region

Luncheons

Dr. Wendell Keck, Publications Officer, Intermountain Station, Ogden, Utah
Mr. Clark Stohl, Representative, 10th U.S. Civil Service Region, Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. Samuel Allan, Personnel Officer, Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. Leslie Norton, Chief Position Classifier, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah
Mr. Richard Maycock, Manager, Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institute, Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. D. H. Troupe, Security Officer, Marquardt Corporation, Ogden, Utah
Dr. J. D. Williams, Institute of Government, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

INTRODUCTION AND PROGRAM INFORMATION

(Digest)

SPEAKER: Perry Hinkelman, Chief, Classification and Salary-Wage Branch

The theme for this seminar is "Classification in a New Decade". The Chief's Program for the National Forest has outlined an aggressive and expanding course for the U. S. Forest Service in the years ahead. It was with this expansion in mind that the theme was selected. In this dynamic organization it behooves us not only to keep abreast of but as far ahead of these developments as we possibly can. We must read-just our sights and take a new reading. We must gear our thinking and planning to the rapidly changing picture in professions, occupations and the field of position classification in general. Otherwise our activity could very well lose its efficacy and be discarded for some other management technique.

Therefore, to approach realistically the problem of Classification in a New Decade we need to stimulate creative thinking and to apply trained judgment in

1. Clarifying the essential current requirements for classification programs,

2. Identifying the most important principles, philosophies and approaches in achieving classification objectives, and

3. Planning for consistent interpretation of such priciples through improved techniques.

For this seminar we have scheduled a variety of methods of presentation including lectures, panels, work groups, case studies, etc., most of which will be followed by a discussion period. All seminar participants are expected and encouraged to participate in discussion periods through constructive comments and suggestions. Other important features of the structure of the seminar agenda include

1. Discussions of classification trends and philosophies by leaders in the field of classification in other Governmental offices, and

2. Luncheon speakers on topics of general interest and professional importance.

I wish to thank all of you and your supervisors who have made your attendance at this seminar possible. I hope that you derive much benefit, as well as pleasure, from the seminar sessions.

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

(Digest)

SPEAKER: Floyd Iverson, Regional Forester, Intermountain Region, Ogden, Utah

Mr. Iverson graciously welcomed the conferees and guests on behalf of Region 4 of the Forest Service.

He outlined three broad ways in which personnel management can improve the quality and quantity of performance by its people:

1. Improve the quality of personnel through selective recruitment.

2. Provide opportunities for training and development.

3. Provide adequate career opportunities.

Classification should work with other aspects of personnel management in arriving at these objectives. Classification is especially involved in the third item -- since a grade-level progression for each occupation is one aspect providing career opportunities.

Significant classification achievements in the past five years have been the revised standards for foresters and fire control technicians, and the imminent revision of forestry technician standards.

Classification can participate in bringing about program accomplishment and in making the management job easier by helping management in the following specific areas:

1. Advice as to how classification will be affected by proposed organizational changes.

2. Advice and clarification of the technician concept and how it can assist management in getting the job done.

3. Maintenance of grade level equity between occupational areas based on actual duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required.

4. Recognition of morale problems that could be engendered by uncoordinated classification actions.

5. Training of operating people in their responsibilities in the classification processes and gaining acceptance.

6. More definitive, broad-gauged classification inspections made in close liaison with management.

7. Closer coordination between the classification office and the training office in relating job requirements and grade-level distinctions.

8. Simpler classification procedures to reduce paperwork.

9. Equity of grade levels for Service jobs in relation to comparable work in other Federal agencies and in the standards.

10. Achievement of better understanding and elimination of negativis

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

(Digest)

SPEAKER: Reed W. Bailey, Director, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station

Mr. Bailey extended a welcome to all on behalf of the co-host, the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

He made several observations concerning classification and how it contributes to the successful administration of a research program.

1. The degree of success we attain depends upon our people, and classification is primarily concerned with the jobs of these people.

2. Without a system of position classification there would be chaos in any large organization. However, a classification system is not static. It requires constant study of changing programs and job relationship and periodic assessment of the way such changes affect jobs.

3. Classification in the Forest Service has made tremendous strides forward in the past decade. Management now has greater appreciation of the relationship of position classification to organization planning and other program decisions.

4. Rapidly changing research specializations and disciplines require a continuing study by classifiers for understanding. This is necessary to assure that they identify appropriate job structures on which career plans may be based, and evaluate these jobs properly.

5. Classification cannot solve all personnel problems. Classification people must work closely with other personnel people to assure that capable scientists are recruited, promoted, and retained within the government. Classifiers must guard against rigidity, adapt to change and at the same time, apply controls of the system.

6. If laws, policies, and regulations need changing to meet the needs of Forest Service programs, classifiers should assist in defining and describing changes for attention of the policy makers.

The objectives of the seminar as stated in the program indicate recognition of the problems of personnel management in the Forest Service and of the requirements for solving these problems in the new decade.

1. Clarifying the essential current requirements for classification programs.

2. Identifying the most important principles, philosophies and approaches in achieving classification objectives.

3. Planning for consistent interpretation of such principles through improved techniques.

THE JOB AHEAD IN CLASSIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT

(Keynote Address)

SPEAKER: Chalmer K. Lyman, Director, Division of Personnel Management
U. S. Forest Service

Folks, I want to talk about the job you have ahead in classification and personnel management. It's going to be big and full of challenges.

To function best, classifiers need to understand personnel management in general and the world we live in. The world about us is changing in some areas at tremendous rates, in other areas at a lesser rate. Regardless of where you look, changes are occurring. All of us must anticipate, recognize, and adjust to these changes.

We are basically a conservative outfit. We don't go off half-cocked, and I hope we don't become too moss-backed and provincial.

One of the big changes I've noticed has been in the habits of the American family. For example, 30 years ago there were many chores to be done in and around the home and everybody pitched in. It was a family or team project. Everyone, including the youngsters, had specific responsibilities. Today we have all kinds of electrical appliances and modern conveniences eliminating the need for many of these former tasks. Many parents are not filling the gap by creating challenging tasks for their children. This applies to play as well as work. Entertainment is originating more and more from outside the family -- television has been a big factor. More mothers are working outside the home.

Now what does this mean to us? It means that a higher percentage of the yound people coming into the Forest Service have not yet developed a full sense of responsibility. Please don't get me wrong -- I do have a faith and confidence in our youth. In some ways they are much wiser than we were at that age. But the fact remains that we are going to have to help them mature and accept responsibilities.

Now as to some aspects of the job we have ahead in personnel management. If the full national forest program goes through, our activities will double. The recruitment and classification job will increase in pace. Time and skill will be needed to get the quantity and quality of Foresters, Engineers, Accountants, Soil Scientists, Clerks, wage board people, and others that we are going to need. Competition for talent will be keen, I can assure you, and prior to each of these recruitment actions a position must be classified.

We are going to have to give more attention to people after recruitment. We are losing too many people because they were not treated properly during the first few months on the job. In addition, we have to do a better job of weeding out misfits.

In placement, we need to pick people with high potential, train them rapidly, and sometimes promote them faster than we would normally want to do.

I would like to spend a few minutes talking about what I think makes the Forest Service "click". The majority of our people are dedicated, industrious, intelligent, capable and enthusiastic. They have faith in what they are doing, and in each other. They are proud to belong to this outfit. They work together -- sometimes play together -- for a common purpose.

We need to understand why these qualities are inherent in the Forest Service. Here are a few reasons:

1. Idealism of the founders has been a constructive and guiding light throughout our history.

2. Managerial skills are being developed constantly through our line-type organization.

3. Our decentralization assigns authority to each person, commensurate with his capabilities and his assignment.

4. Fair dealing and treatment are afforded through the merit system.

5. Dedication to our customers -- the public, permittees and forest users is a part of our credo.

6. An open door policy encourages interchanges between those in lower positions with those in top positions.

There are other reasons, of course, such as the way many of our people grow up in the organization; the exposure to and sharing of hardships, physical discomfort, or danger; and the relaxation which comes after. Who can sit around a campfire in the back country with a group of men after a hard day's work without learning the true meaning of fellowship?

Let's talk now about classification and management relationships. I know we have made good progress in this are in the last four to five years.

In the past managers didn't understand classification. They thought it a mystery. We have come a long way from this misconception. Management people have developed respect for good classification work. They now seek the advice of classifiers. Managers are learning that classification is based on good common sense. They are beginning to accept more responsibility in this area. However, we have not reached the point where we can reduce audit standards. Our job will be to work with managers for greater accomplishments. The passive or negative approach won't serve management. Certainly, it is not for us.

This leads me to my last point - Classification cannot do a good job without sometimes having to render a "no" decision. Management expects you to say "no" when it is necessary and justified. You will be much more successful saying "no" if you know how to say "no". Here are some better ways:

1. Be polite; be tactful. Excitement, anger, or nervousness will make your task more difficult. If a person asks for something you can't grant, the least you can do is say, "I'm glad you asked that."

2. Be firm and positive. Say "no" but explain why in a way that will be understood clearly. If you make a mistake admit it readily.

3. Take your time -- time your "no". Be calm. A "yes" decision will be well received any time -- not so with a "no" decision.

4. Don't be a policy and rules peddler. Give your reasons -- don't quote and lean on manuals, handbooks, standards, etc.

5. Offer a substitute. Leave the person an out -- an opportunity to save face.

6. Ask yourself if a "yes" answer would do any real harm.

COMMUNICATION IN THE FOREST SERVICE

(In Full)

LUNCHEON SPEAKER: Wendell M. Keck, Editor, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ogden, Utah

I have taken the liberty of narrowing the scope of my talk to a discussion of written communication. I have done this for two reasons: First, written communication is your end-product and probably your chief difficulty -- at least you are more aware of it as a difficulty than you probably are of difficulty in oral communication. Second, I have had more first-hand experience with written communication than with spoken.

Let us first understand the relation between classification and communication. Classification of any kind -- whether it be "Classification in a New Decade," classification of plants, animals, or Forest Service personnel -- is an intellectual process. But to be useful it has to be communicated to someone. This requires using words; hence usable classification becomes essentially a language problem.

Next, let us look at the nature of the difficulties you may have in the writing job connected with job classification -- at least as they appear to me. Difficulty No. 1 arises from the circumstance that we have language as a working tool, and our language is constantly growing and otherwise changing. A well known TV personality (not named Van Doren!) recently observed 1/that since Shakespeare's time the English language has about quintupled in size. Probably this is a rather conservative estimate. Research has provided us with hundreds of new things in the two decades just past-- new substances and new processes; every new thing has had to be named. Most things perform some king of action; these actions have to be named too. Every action has several associated qualities, and these have somehow to be described. A full 20 years ago I read that radio has added more than 3,000 words to the English language. When you consider that nearly 50 percent of some manufacturers' sales today are of products that were not in existence even 5 years ago, you can visualize better the speed at which the English language is growing.

To the linguist and the grammarian, this means that a whole host of new nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs has inevitably been added to the language. In the Forest Service we go in for evaluation, and that process, too, requires appropriate terminology. Names for the new things often have to be new words -- usually coined from the supposedly "dead" languages of Latin and Greek. Sometimes, but less often, the new actions the new things perform require new words to designate them. For the qualities and evaluation we are generally content to use such old familiar words as "good," "deficient," "excellent," "inadequate," etc. So Difficulty Number 1 is working with an enlarging language.

A second important characteristic of today's changing English language is constantly changing style dictated, of course, by changing taste. This is not necessarily a source of difficulty -- in fact, it is actually a source of increased ease in usage. The general direction of this change is from the formal toward the colloquial; i.e., our written language is coming to be more like our spoken -- or at least more like what we think our spoken language is. Even the term "colloquial" is taking on a sort of respectability -- hardly prestige yet -- that it did not have 30 years ago.

1/ Evans, Bergen. Your Speech is Changing. Think. Aug. 1959. P. 2.

Another language factor to be considered is the emergency and wide-spread use -- nay, a sort of reverence -- for a highly specialized professional jargon. It develops quite casually; it is understood by the "initiated"; it separates those who "know" from those who don't; and utlimately it becomes a sort of linguistic crutch, standing for practically everything and meaning practically nothing. A good example is "gismo", which attained such widespread use and popularity in the armed forces during World War II. Depending on who was using the word, "gismo" meant a recoil spring, a helmet liner, a tractor -- what you will. I do not object to the emergence and existence of a jargon per se -- one might as well object to rise and fall of the tides -- but I am certain that in the interest of clarity we must keep it out of written communication. The objections to jargon like the objections to slang and faulty spelling are that it often hinders the reader from getting the writer's point. It does this by unconsciously calling the reader's attention to the wrong things -- i.e., to the secondary and irrelevant. If the reader does not get the writer's point, then the labor of writing was in vain.

A fourth cause of our difficulty, at least sometimes, is the requirement to communicate in somewhat stereotyped forms. These may be forms of sentences, of phrases, or of single words. This is one origin of the cliché, often a deadly enemy to precise expression. The results are sometimes harmless, sometimes ridiculous. As a sample of stereotyped phrase, consider the conversation between the housewife and the electrical repairman. She said, "Please be careful while you're working close to that dining table -- it goes back to Louis the 14th." "What? You too?" the repairman replied. "All my dining room furniture goes back to Sears the 15th."

One of our common techniques that results in stereotyped word forms is the addition of -ize to a noun or adjective to make it a verb -- as oxidize, criticize, realize, formalize, etc. (The two latest favorites in this family are "finalize," which I abominate -- all it means is "finish!" -- and "minimize" which is usually used incorrectly to mean "reduce to the minimum.") Sometimes we go a step further and add -ation to -ize to make another noun, as realization. A few years ago one of my professional colleagues came into my office laughing over this sentence by one of his freshman students: "And so the older generation expects us to solutionize the problems they created." I said: "Look, pal, one of these days you'll get the sentence: 'And so the older generation expects us to find the solutionization of the problems it created." These are two jokes related to this example: (1) All that that freshman needed was the simple verb solve. (2) Sometimes we run into federal writing that reminds us of solutionization -- it expresses a simple idea the hard way.

The fifth and final difficulty I shall list -- and it is peculiarly yours -- is that much of your writing requires the description of action or processes. Admittedly, this is a difficult type of writing. You can demonstrate an action much more easily that you can describe it in words. For example, try to describe the action of tying a knot in your shoestring or your necktie. That's fairly easy. But when you have to list and/or describe all the kinds of activities that are a part of a man's job -- and especially when you try to cast it in one 60-word sentence -- you and your reader are both headed for trouble. Here's what I mean:

> "As a full member of the forest supervisor's staff participates in the formulation of forest policies, objectives, programs and plans relative to administration, protection and use of forest resources, wherein administrative and business management activities and functions are generally or specifically an integral part of the over-all process of forest administration."

And so, between working with a growing and otherwise changing language, having to avoid use of a jargon that is familiar to you but possibly not to your readers, having to work sometimes within certain stereotyped forms, and having to reduce actions to

words -- we have troubles. These are not the only kinds, but they are representative. In spite of all these cramping difficulties, we are supposed to write stuff that is usable and clear!

So much for seeing what our troubles are. Now what can we do about solving them? Sometimes problem-solving has to be accomplished by rather indirect means. Recently I heard of a parent who devised an effective method of getting his son off to to school on time. He bought the kid a car. Now the boy has to leave home in time to find a parking place.

During nearly twenty years of trying to teach unwilling college students how to write well and easily, I tried to follow up every lead, hint, ad, etc., that promised to provide a magic key to unlock a solution to this universal problem of easy, clear writing. But the fact is that writing that is easy to read and comprehend is hardly ever easy to write; and, conversely, writing that is done by persons who think "easy" writing is clear hardly ever is. Not long ago the USDA Employees News Bulletin had an excellent summary: "Of all the rules of efficient and effective public speaking, preparation is probably the most fundamental and possibly the most overlooked." This statement is equally true for effective writing.

All this is not to say, though, that there is nothing we can do to improve the quality and effectiveness of our writing -- even the writing of position descriptions and position classification reports. I take it to be a hopeful sign that the Civil Service Commission recently published a bulletin titled "Less Paperwork in Position Classification" and that you have scheduled a discussion of this. The principal aid to improving most types of writing is the single but by no means simple matter of Keeping Your Reader(s) Constantly in MIND: and by "constantly" I mean at every stage of the process, from planning and outlining through writing, revision, and publication.

And how do you keep your reader in mind?

First, you have to decide who he is. This is the most important single decision or analysis you have to make about any piece of writing you do; for your answer to the key question WHO IS MY READER? will bear on answering many other questions. I'll take this up further in a moment. Deciding who your reader is may be difficult, but time spent answering this key question, WHO IS MY READER? is some of the best-spent time you can invest. The New Testament gives us the story of a questioner who asked Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" The answer, of course, was the wonderful parable of the Good Samaritan, which is still one of the best explications of how to live a good life. But note this important distinction: It is right to treat your neighbor as yourself, but you had better not treat your reader as yourself: You'll take too much for granted and will write carelessly.

Who is your reader? Is he a Forest Supervisor? Is he a group of them? Is he someone on the Supervisor's staff? He may be a Ranger. Maybe he is someone in W. O. He might unexpectedly turn out to be the Chief. You might not plan to have the Chief as a reader, but someone might refer your document to him, and it certainly will be to your credit to have it so clear that he can understand it easily. WHO IS MY READER? is the fundamental question to keep in mind constantly. Unless you do this and write for him, you'll lapse into a mental state in which you'll write for yourself instead of for him, and that is fatal!

When you have adequately answered WHO IS MY READER? you have at least provided yourself with a guide to the answer to many other questions that will or should arise, such as: What does he already know about this matter? Does he know this word?

Will he interpret this statement correctly? (Rather, could he possibly misinterpret this statement?) Have I spelled this out in enough detail? Should I use a table to present this information, or will a graph do the job better? Will a photograph clarify this idea, or would a sketch be clearer? How much explanation does this statement require? Knowing -- or at least accurately imaging your reader -- is of prim importance.

Two more questions are important at the planning stage of any writing job -- especially the writing of reports -- WHAT DOES HE NEED TO KNOW? and WHAT DOES HE WANT TO KNOW? Answers to these two questions will pretty well define for you the the general scope of the content of your writing and they will materially aid you in selection of details that should be included and others that should be excluded; that is why they are important. Answers to these two questions may overlap somewhat, but this does not mean that you can safely ignore either one. From your point of view as writer, the question of "What does he WANT to know?" may be as important as "What does he NEED to know?" for he may need to know some things that he does not realize. In this connection, also, note that your anticipation of his "Why?" questions may be invaluable.

A fourth question that bears on both planning and writing is highly important when you look over your masterpiece. This one is: AM I TELLING HIM? This one you use when you evaluate your writing prior to and during revision; it lets you know whether your piece of writing is complete. To give or get the right answer to this question, you have to put yourself in the reader's shoes. This is another reason why answering the question "Who is my reader?" is important. If the answer to "Am I telling him?" is "No", or "Not fully," then you are in for some more writing. If your reader has asked for or assigned you this report, then for your own good you had better keep asking yourself, "Am I telling him?"

The speaker, of course, must mentally raise for himself another question, and this one, or its answer, may be distressing: "Is he getting it?" As writer, you will get the answer to this one -- maybe not immediately, maybe not directly, but eventually, and certainly -- and maybe disappointingly!

Thus far I have chiefly considered guides for planning and criticizing your writing. Now I am going to give three brief prescriptions for sharpening and clarifying your expression. I will use the term "prescription" advisedly since your program lists me as "Dr.". Of course it is the kind of "doctor" that one dear old lady said "can't do you any good." These prescriptions are applicable to all the kinds of writing you do -- from writing position classification reports to writing your wives at home -- but they are especially important in your professional work.

The first of these prescriptions is: USE DEFINITE STATEMENTS. That means: In every sentence tell who or what acts and what kind of act he or it performs. To state this another way, see that every sentence tells WHO DOES WHAT. That is what it is supposed to do. If you can write sentences that do this, and at the same time can resist the temptation to pile on the qualifying words, phrases, and clauses, you will be read and understood easily. But if you write, "On the basis of the evidence at hand, this appears not to be the case," you deserve whatever happens to you! Why? Now look at that sentence. Who was the doer? "This." What did he do? "Appeared not to be the case." What do you know now that you didn't know before you read the sentence -- except that this is a lousy sentence? For this situation just say: "The evidence shows that this did not happen."

A few days ago I picked up this little gem from some manual supposed to help personnel officers evaluate initiative in employees. The manual said, "If this characteristic is conspicuously absent, it is unlikely to develop in a person, regardless of the number of training courses taken or other incentives instituted." (26 words.) Translation: "If a man has no initiative, you can't develop it." (10 words.) Or, "You can't develop what he doesn't have." (7 words.)

The second presciption is: WRITE (or speak) EFFICIENTLY. This means several things. One is: be concise. This means: Don't use 500 words on a 200-word job. It also means: Use the word-tool appropriate to your task. If you are stating an action, use an action word. Of course a chisel and a saw both cut wood, but it is a bum carpenter who thinks these two tools are interchangeable! Why say, "We made an inspection of the Ashley Forest" when you obviously mean, "We inspected the Ashley Forest"? You didn't make anything; so why say you did? A writer says, "Considerable invasion of undesirable exotic plants has taken place." Who did what? The sentence says that "invasion took place.? Logic tells you that nothing of the sort happened. The action that occurred was invasion, and plants did the invading. What the writer meant was: "Numerous undesirable exotic plants invaded this area." That sentence tells who did what."

Here is another little horrible example of not saying what was meant, and taking too many words to do it: "We have prepared a list of twelve basic traits which we believe are most significant. These are listed on the revised form and briefly described in the instructions for preparing a characteristics analysis." What's wrong here? In the first place, the doer, we, didn't prepare anything; he, or they, listed some traits. All that the writer meant to say was: "On the revised form for preparing a character analysis, we have listed and briefly described 12 significant personality traits." Frankly, I think my version is better than the original -- By the way, did one of you write it? -- for two reasons: (1) It tells accurately what was done. (2) It accomplishes this in 19 words instead of 33. So what? Just multiply this one statement by 100 and you have 1,900 words (about 9 typewritten pages) against 3,300 words (16 pages). There must be some principle in physics to the effect that mechanical efficiency of a machine decreases as the noise of its operation increases. Well, Keck's Law in writing is that the efficiency of a sentence decreases as the number of needless words increases.

My third prescription is: SELECT ACCURATE WORDS. Sure, this will slow you down, but it will help greatly to assure that your reader will get your idea. If he doesn't get it, you've wasted your words and your time. Of course all grammatical classes of words are important, and you should make your selection of words accurate in any of them. Teachers have been prone to insist on accuracy of the words that describe, but I want to call attention to two other types that need special watching, verbs and connective words. The verbs are important because they tell the action of the sentence; in short, they are the language dynamos that put power into statements. That is why I cringe so often when Government writers use initiate when they obviously mean begin or start; when they write about the Forest Service "redeeming its responsibility" when they clearly mean "fulfilling it."

A while ago I quoted a description of a certain administrative officer's job that says he "participates in the formulation of forest policies, objectives, programs and plans relative to administration, etc. ...." How does he "participate"? Agree with the Supervisor? Argue with him? Collect opinions from rangers, recreationists, and ranchers? Make the coffee for staff meetings? Just what does he do? Now I'll back down a bit. I don't know what "participate" meant to the writer, but I was not his intended or expected reader. For the moment I'll be charitable and assume that the writer knew who his reader(s) would be and knew that they would know what he meant by "participate." Do you agree now that knowing the reader is important for the writer?

To recapitulate very briefly: we all have writing jobs to do. We want our work to be functionally adequate -- or maybe a bit better than this bare minimum. We do reasonably well now, but we want to do better; and we can do better -- quite a little better, in fact, by keeping in mind several self-prodding questions, to wit:

Who is my reader?

What does he NEED to know?

Why is it important?

What does he WANT to know?

Am I telling him?

(Is he getting it?)

Who does what?

* * * * * * * * *

A CAREER PLAN FOR FOREST SERVICE POSITION CLASSIFIERS

PROBLEM ANALYSIS:
I. Perry B. Hinkelman
II. Mildred Rasmussen
III. Neil Opsal
IV. Franklin Salzman

HAND-OUT MATERIALS:
Career Plan for Forest Service Position Classifiers (Draft)
Seven Phases of a Well-Rounded Executive Development Program (K. Borgen)
Forward Planning and Replacement Schedule (Standard Oil Company Sample)

I. CAREER PLAN FOR FOREST SERVICE POSITION CLASSIFIERS

P. B. Hinkelman

I am happy to be able to present to this group today a draft of a career plan for Forest Service Position Classifiers. Such a plan has been a dream of mine for a long time. We were only able to describe it, as you see it today, after some experiment and study in connection with the intensive training of classifiers during the past two years or so. I hope you will give its contents and provisions your careful review.

Before we examine the plan, I'd like to mention a couple of ideas that I believe are part of the underlying philosophy for any career program. I've observed that some of the concepts of developing people have changed as much during the past 20 years as some of the styles in ladies' hats -- to say nothing of the various new looks in shoes!

First, a Career Development Plan should provide a framework in which people can grow, utilize their capacities to the utmost, provide a maximum quality of service, and satisfy their aspirations and personal values. The plan should give more than lip service to the recognition that people -- especially people with common bonds, interests, and values which are congenial with the values of the organization -- are the greatest resources of the organization.

A career plan should recognize too that the degree of success in accomplishing the objectives of an organization correlates with the degree to which the goals of the people making up the unit are satisfied. This does not mean that the individual must be unsupervised, or that his loyalty can be bought through complete freedom from organizational restraint. Fitting into the organization is an important job requirement that people must meet. This does mean, however, that we must know the kind of people we need, help them to develop themselves, and then offer a career program which can provide realistic and satisfying rewards for those who have the capacity and the drive to meet the requirements for growth.

To apply this principle to classification in the Forest Service: the goals of our classification program are most effectively achieved when the work is done by alert cooperative individuals who are realizing some of their own goals in accomplishing the objectives of the classification program. When each individual perceives himself as "really belonging" to the group, when he believes in the goals of the organization, and when he respects the way the organization treats its people in actual practice, a wonderful thing happens to the morale of a work group. Each individual is then able to realize some of his personal objectives through his sharing in the achievement of the objectives of the organization unit in which he works. This situation is a highly desirable result of active and sound personnel programs.

We believe that a career program, such as the one we are proposing, will encourage the kind of employee-involvement that I've just described. For example, we'd like our career plan to work in such a way that there is a suitable challenge for every classifier in the Forest Service, and so that no Forest Service classifier is in a dead-end job through lack of opportunity. We'd like this career plan also to help us in meeting long-range Forest Service requirements for classifier services -- in quality and numbers of staff. We'd like the classification work to be done in such a way that more and more frequently our regional foresters and directors and other program people will come in and say, "I want to commend the classifiers. We couldn't do without their help. We need to see more of them, because they are valuable to us." You will admit that we could use a little more of this kind of response to our work.

The fundamentals of our plan are these rather simple but important principles:

1. Organization of classification programs must be clear, sound, and consistent at all levels of organization, so that all know what to expect. This ties in with your discussions at last year's conference concerning the need to clarify the role of the classifier and the quality of service we're prepared to offer.

2. An integrated system of staffing patterns, appraisal practices, and promotion plans -- to assure, by continuing assessment and positive promotion actions, (taken only when warranted) that the best people are placed in our most responsible classification and wage positions.

3. Sufficient communication in explaining the plan -- to assure understanding and acceptance on the part of all concerned.

4. Effective procedures for carrying out this plan and for its periodic review and revision -- to assure that it continues to meet Forest Service needs and that the principles of the plan will be applied uniformly.

5. A training and development system geared to the plan -- to enable our classifiers to plan and achieve improvements or further development along lines that will qualify them for positions of greater difficulty and responsibility.

6. Continuous monitoring of the program at Washington Office and field level -- to provide leadership and guidance, to assure consistency of application, and to facilitate coordination with representatives of the Department and the Civil Service Commission.

7. An active research program to evaluate effectiveness of this plan as it progresses -- to identify weaknesses requiring correction or additonal areas requiring development.

8. Most important of all, the enthusiastic support of all of you who are involved and of your supervisors -- to provide the atmosphere that is essential to a fair pilot application of this undertaking.

Now Mrs. Rasmussen will present some of the major provisions of the plan.

II. SOME OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED CAREER PLAN FOR FOREST SERVICE CLASSIFICATION AND WAGE SPECIALISTS

Mildred R. Rasmussen

There is nothing revolutionary and little that is new in the career plan that is being proposed for your review. The plan is unique only in that it has been tailored to meet certain demonstrated needs of Forest Service classification and wage people.

If the principles of a career development plan can be agreed upon, our next step will be to attempt to obtain approval from the Department and the Civil Service Commission for a special training agreement based upon this career plan. If our plan is shown to be sound and consistent with the principles of present policy on promotions, executive development, and employment, we may then be able to arrange a more fruitful sequence of developmental plans than those which are now rather loosely delineated and followed.

Explanatory Comments

Most of you have seen this draft today for the first time. A combined course of study and syllabus is not exactly designed for quick browsing. For this reason, I should like to point out some of the key features of the proposal by calling your attention specifically to certain sections of the draft. At a later date, stations and regions will be asked to make official management review and comment. Today we expect only your personal reactions.

Before we examine the draft itself let's look at one of the guide sheets handed you in this session -- a letter-sized chart titled "Seven Phases of a Well-Rounded Executive Development Program." The "phases", that are rather graphically related in this chart, form the basis of a career plan. If we invest a little time we shall be repaid, I believe, by our greater insight into career planning. Notice that the first major "phase", "Organization Planning", consists of three concurrent steps:

1. Organization requirements projected in terms of future needs.

2. Time schedule of replacements for retirees, transfers, and other losses.

3. Requirements interpreted into current position descriptions - position classifiers shouldn't have any opposition to that one!

Now notice the theory behind this grouping. Once these three aspects of organization planning are complete, a program for "Appraisals of Executive Performance and Potentials" is phased in. We now know these functions as the Performance Rating System and the Promotion Plan Appraisal.

There is an important note in capitals at the bottom of this chart: "ORGANIZATION PLANNING, WHEN COMBINED WITH APPRAISALS PROVIDES AN EXECUTIVE INVENTORY AGAINST FUTURE NEEDS". This then is the foundation upon which the development plans for classification and wage specialists are built.

Five other phases of executive development are shown on the graphic chart to fan out from the two basic phases that we have discussed. These should be noted carefully, for they recur in the basic, intermediate, and advanced levels of formal and intensive classifier development plans. These five developmental phases, starting at the outside and moving inward to the core of the plan, are the following:

1. INTERNSHIP - selection and training of younger persons from company, college, (and other Service programs).

2. ROTATION - of selected persons through key positions to broader interests and experiences.

3. A CIRRICULUM - of conferences, seminars, and other systematic instructions.

4. The use of CONSULTATIVE MANAGEMENT through periodic staff conferences (and work shops) on all levels.

5. Planned assignment of UNDERSTUDIES in key training positions.

Now to return to the draft, our career plan follows this phased outline, once the Forest Service framework is set, in the introductory portion under "I. General Information."

General Information (pages 1-3 of the draft, identified as Section I)

Mr. Hinkelman has briefed you on some of the definitions and objectives of the career plan for Forest Service classifiers. He has emphasized a philosophy of guided growth, and pointed out the necessity for joint understandings and cooperation between field and Washington Office on this program as on all others.

Here are a few questions about coverage of the plan, and future sources of classification and wage specialists. I'd like to throw these questions out now, as you glance at the discussion of "coverage", and hope that you will bring up your comments during the discussion period:

1. Should Station classifiers be covered by permissively, as they have been in the past, or specifically, as regional classification and wage specialists are?

2. Should additional examples of wage specialist on-the-job training be given, or are present example sufficient?

3. Is it desirable to continue to have at least 50 percent of the classifiers transfer laterally into classification and wage work from other occupational categories within the Forest Service - now largely foresters with a few engineers, business managers, administrative personnel?

4. Should at least half of the classification and wage staff be majors in public and personnel administration, education, psychology, economics, industrial management, and related fields, such as those certified from Federal Service Entrance Examination registers and those transferred from other agencies at intermediate and senior grade levels, when no desirable in-Service selections are available? (See Qualification Standards, CSC Manual X-118).

Now, to the discussion of "Principles" on pages 2-3. While all of these principles merit close reading, as Mr. Hindelman has mentioned, the one numbered three is of particular interest. That principle concerns the need for having available, to fill classifier vacancies, reserves of trained and experienced classification and wage specialiests. These vacancies occur at field and Washington office level, through retirements, through transfers into other areas of work, and through promotions

into related positions. Just before the session someone asked this question: "Why talk about building up a reserve of classifiers - aren't all vacancies but one now filled?"

I won't attempt to estimate the effect on classifier staffing needs of the additonal and expanded programs of the new decade. That will be part of latest Servicewide planning. I will make a partial answer to the question, however, by directing your attention to a quick look backward and into the future.

During the past 3 1/2 years, classifier losses have included one death, two promotions to personnel officer positions, one retirement, and two transfers outside the Service. Accessions of trained and experienced classifiers from outside the Service have included five individuals during the past 2 1/2 years. Selection and lateral transfers into classification, and among regions and stations, under executive development training agreements, have included more than 20 individuals during the past four years. Of four classification officers at region level have been selected and trained in the past 2 1/2 to 3 years, seven are top classification officials at stations, and three others occupy senior positions in the work. Nine classifiers are currently in an initial training status, and a new training class will probably be conducted in the fall. These figures do not include orientation of station chiefs of administrative management divisions, or personnel officers. What does this show about reserves? It shows that there has been an expansion and a great turn-over in classification personnel during the past four years.

In looking at the future for a moment, I wish merely to report some statistics as of November 15, 1959, which reflect some of the retirement replacements that must be staffed during the new decade. Three items of information are provided concerning individuals in GS-11, 12, and 13, who have full or part time classification authority in regions, stations, or Washington Office:

	GS-11	GS-12	GS-13
Average Age in Years	38	45	53
Average Government Experience in Years	9	19	27
Average Estimated Service Expectancy in Years	30	17	9

Periodic Inventory of Classifier Manpower Against Future Needs (pp. 3-6 of the draft, identified as Section II)

As we noticed in our examination of the Executive-Development Phasing Chart, a periodic inventory of manpower against future needs is based upon organization planning and appraisal. In the draft we have suggested, under review or organization requirements, that each unit of the organization analyze program objectives for the classification and wage activities; determine the extent and quality of services that will be provided, by reference to new classification standards and to manning principles; and determine how many and what grades of classification and wage specialist positions will be needed.

Some critical elements for guidance in these steps are outlined in the discussion under organization planning. It is extremely important that the full scope of a classification and wage program be understood, and that we have agreement within the Forest Service concerning appropriate grade-level values under the new classification standards.

Time schedules of what positions have to be filled at what time by replacement, will need to be established and then periodically brought up to date, as changes develop in plans of individuals and in intensity of the program. Later in the program Neil Opsal will talk with you about two modern types of replacement schedule.

A guide for appraisal of classifiers will be issued, following the framework of the established promotional plan and the performance rating system. We hope to get suggestions from you as to items on which classifier personnel appraisals should be based.

Plans for Developing Position Classifiers in the Forest Service under a Formal Career Plan (pp. 6-14 of the draft, identified as Section III)

The form of these plans is similar to that which has been used by departments and agencies who have succeeded in obtaining CSC approval for special training agreements for classifier careers. You will notice that this plan applies both to laterally-trained classifiers who move into classification from other disciplines, typically at the GS-9 level, as well as to vertically trained classifiers who enter the work through the more conventional channels of FSEE.

Please notice too that three levels of training are provided: basic, intermediate, and senior or advanced. Each of these levels of training includes on-the-job training, as well as the techniques of rotation, coaching, understudy, rotation, internship, and a formal curriculum of conferences and seminars. Several aspects of this approach are of such interest to some of you, that you may wish to discuss them in detail during or after this seminar. For example:

1. All trainees shall receive six months of on-the-job training and guidance at the local field level before they are eligible for the WO course for intensive development of classifiers, and full completion of this course includes formal classroom work, assigned readings, on-the-job training in WO staff classification activities, and acceptance and approval of a completed classification trainee project.

2. Rotation assignments including completion of successful classification and wage work in one region plus a "Washington year", during which time an advanced course of training is undertaken. The "Washington year" typically shall occur before advancement to the GS-12 level, and, if not there, before the GS-13 level is achieved.

3. To assure breadth and depth of classification officers, rotation involving completion of successful classification and wage activities in two regions, or at one region and at Washington Office as a staff member, including specialized training activities at that level are required training for entrance to GS-13, over and beyond the normal qualification requirements under X118. Responsibilities for the administration of this career plan, as indicated on pages 7-8, will be distributed among Washington Office, Region and Station, and the trainee himself who, in the last analysis, is primarily responsible for assuring his own personal development.

The draft you hold represents many hours of work on the part of several persons. We hope that you will give it serious study. We hope you will find that it meets your needs. If it fails in any way, let us work out the required improvements together.

The coverage of formal instruction, the variety of assignments undertaken, the quality level of projects required, and the illustrations of on-the-job assignments are based upon a variety of experiences in this and other agencies, in the training of classifiers, and have been correlated with the levels of the new classification standards.

III. EXAMPLES OF MANPOWER REPLACEMENT SCHEDULING IN TWO WORK SITUATIONS (Digest)

N. B. Opsal

You have each received a chart, "Forward Planning and Replacement Schedule". This chart shows how a large company formally and systematically prepares for the promotions of its key people and for their replacements. To replace the incumbents of any given key position, a number of candidates have been developed to take over the job. We have no such replacement schedule for our jobs, although our inventories have shown that planned replacements will be needed for certain age and grade categories.

An objective of the company plan before you is to identify people who at any one time have the greatest potential for a certain position that will soon be vacant. It is also designed to identify systematically all potential vacancies to result from retirements, promotions, transfers, or other losses. Another objective is to plan orderly replacements of the person about to transfer or retire by understudy and detail or by direct assignment for staffing behind such replacements.

The company's plan is annually reviewed for currency and planning purposes. The review considers:

(1) the adequacy of the chart;
(2) the appraisal of the men in key positions;
(3) the appraisal of replacement candidates; this includes a summary of actions taken or planned to develop employees in present positions with particular reference to couseling, on-the-job training, job rotation and off-the-job training;
(4) the appraiser's opinion of the value of the plan and how it might be improved.

In all cases, the employee's interests -- both work and personal -- are strongly considered before a transfer is made to a new job or location.

We have charted on the easel another illustration of long-range planning of the kind that must provide quality staff replacement activities.

Benedict and Bové in describing a career plan for ordnance specialists reported that of 180 employees recruited at GS-5 as career potential, 115 were able to go to GS-7 and 9. 68 went to GS-11, 40 to GS-12 and 14 to GS-13 and 14. This device, called a "Career Cone" might indicate that for optimum quality selection, somewhere in government today more than a hundred potential classifiers in GS-5, 7, and 9 would be screened for the 14 GS-13 and 14 replacements that will be needed in less than five years in the Forest Service Classification and Wage programs.

IV. A PROPOSED FOREST SERVICE CLASSIFICATION CAREER CHART

Franklin Salzman

Mr. Salzman presented a proposed career chart, following customary Forest Service career charting techniques to illustrate the normal career lines provided under the proposed career plan for classifiers. The chart had not been given final approval.

Two major sources of candidates for career classifiers were mentioned. Current practices provide for lateral transfer of GS-7 and GS-9 foresters, engineers, and others from the professional ranks to classifier positions in the same grade, by use of executive development agreements. Recruitment or use of graduates in public administration, personnel administration, and similar fields was cited as a desirable procedure, to balance the present laterial training plan.

The proposed chart elected considerable interest from the floor. Special interest was shown in the following points for the classifier:

Career Plan:

1. Classification experience in two regions or one region and Washington Office is desirable before a classifier can be considered for GS-12 or for a higher grade position as for example, Regional Classification Officer.

2. Transfers between administrative or other professional fields and classification work where possible, under lateral training concepts. The experience and training would continue to be considered on the basis of the individual case.

3. Selection of classifiers from inside the Service, rather than by recruitment from outside sources, has in the past been basic Forest Service policy.

4. The career plan "package" would be given further review in the Chief's office after receipt of field suggestions to be in an official communication, and by the approval as required in the Department and/or the Civil Service Commission. It would then be processed through regular channels.

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY

(Digest)

PANEL: Ernest Harris, Walter Mann, Neil Opsal, Charles Petersen

HAND-OUT MATERIALS: Distribution of Responsibility for Forest Service Classification Act Program - 10 pages, (W. O.)
Distribution of Responsibility for Forest Service Wage Administration Program - 2 pages (W. O.)
Responsibilities for Position Classification at the Operating Level - 4 pages (W. O.)

I. IDENTIFICATION OF GUIDE LINE MATERIALS

Neil Opsal

As a framework for consideration of the topic, the attention of seminar members was directed to the three sets of responsibility -- distribution charts pertaining to the classification and wage programs as they function at various levels of the organization. These are drafts of guides developed as training materials. Comments on their content will be welcomed. They may be used to orient classifiers during their on-the-job training prior to their intensive training at Washington Office. These guides may be of value also to classification officers in planning long-range workload and staffing needs. They have been found especially helpful in discussions with operating officials on the subject of joint classifier-supervisor responsibilities in classification areas.

The first guide shows, in responsibility-distribution chart form, the continuing responsibility of the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, the Department, the Chief's Office, and field levels, in carrying out major functional areas of responsibility for the program under the Classification Act.

The second guide shows, also in responsibility-distribution chart form, the continuing responsibility of the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, the Department, the Chief's Office, regions, and other field levels, in carrying out functional areas in the administration of wage programs.

The third guide shows, in similar form, the continuing responsibilities of the operating supervisor, the employee, and the position classification officer, the carrying out the various functions relating to position classification and wage work at the operating level.

Interchange of information among classifiers and operating officials is indicated on these guide lines as a continuing responsibility.

Field classification officers may reproduce or modify these guides for local use as appropriate. Copies of all revisions should be sent to Washington Office, Attention: Classification and Salary-Wage Branch.

II. WHAT OPERATING OFFICIALS HAVE A RIGHT TO EXPECT FROM THE CLASSIFICATION OFFICER

Ernest Harris

There is urgent need for improved understanding between classification and management representatives - as to the individual responsibility of each in the classification process. Management should provide the classification officer with required information and access; the classification officer should provide sound and useful classification services, in keeping with the objectives outlined in Chapter A-4 of the Federal Personnel Manual. Some services which the operating official may expect from the classification officer:

1. Procedures, guide lines, and standards:

   The classification officer should solicit ideas and participation from management officials, as to what guide lines are most needed, and they should assure that guide lines developed for the use of operating supervisors are simple, specific, and up to date. Classifiers should establish such aids as typical position descriptions or special question lists where appropriate, for the purpose of facilitating or holding to a minimum the preparation of individual descriptions by operating supervisors.

2. Organization changes:

   Classification officers can advise operating officials on the effects upon job values of possible organization patterns. Advice of this type can sometimes be used to aid in getting work done more effectively or to utilize the skills and special qualifications of individuals. Line officials should discuss with classification representatives any proposed reorganization or any establishments of new positions, prior to the official initiation of such actions. In such discussions classifiers can provide advice as to grade-level impact on existing and proposed positions, and requirements for redescriptions of other positions.

3. Classification audits and reviews:

   Classification officers should regularly audit samples of positions in each organization, to (a) assure internal alignment of positions across organization and series lines; (b) assure general conformity of classifications with controlling standards, (c) identify units where management has or has not taken seriously the requirements for periodic position review under the Whitten Amendment, (d) provide a check for use of typical position descriptions, and (d) keep the classifier informed and current on duties of positions and interrelationships of programs.

   Classification Officers should participate in Civil Service Commission audits, provide CSC representatives with information and background on Service positions and programs, support classification decisions made under delegated authority, and assure that understandings and agreements are reached with CSC representatives,

appeals initiated if required, higher authority notified as necessary corrective action taken, and reports made as required by the inspection.

4. Wage surveys:

Classification officers must plan and direct periodic surveys to establish equitable rates for wage board employees. They must also study wage board jobs, describe and group them into reasonable categories, and review their actual operation periodically for currency and accuracy of wage level and for internal relationships.

5. Teamwork:

Classification officers should work closely with officers responsible for other personnel management and administrative management program areas, to integrate these activities with classification. They must also work closely with supervisory line personnel to assure that classification is understood and that the optimum utilization of classification services is obtained.

6. Actual classification operations:

Classification officers must see that standards are accurately applied by classifiers and that delegated authority at lower levels is properly discharged. Classifier decisions must be impersonal, and no favoritism should be permitted. Priority in classification matters should be based upon agreed-upon considerations. Emphasis is usually upon actions which affect grade-changes and large populations. Management officials are entitled to review and obtain interpretation of published standards. Classifiers, in reviewing position descriptions for adequacy, should explain what additional information is required and why it is required, so that line officials may grow in their knowledge of classification requirements. Where possible, classification officers should interest line supervisors in the Commission's new standards of adequacy for position descriptions.

7. Development and review of classification standards:

Classification officers should provide assistance to management officials in review of proposed classification standards. They should point out pertinent factors which affect the levels of individual positions, and should work out with operating supervisors the portions of the standards-review in which the line official's participation can be most helpful. Classification officers and operating officials must work together in developing standards that are useful in meeting the Service's needs, and in obtaining modification and revision of standards that are inequitable or inadequate in meeting the Service's needs.

8. Other:

Position classifiers as a group should:

a. Be receptive to suggestions.

b. Keep informed on program changes, developments, and emphases.

c. Keep an open-door policy.

d. Learn to be good listeners.

e. Develop open minds and cooperative attitudes.

f. Cultivate an atmosphere of approval and trust in relationships with operating officials.

g. Demonstrate consistency of actions.

h. Avoid the pose of the "expert".

i. Willingly explain what is required for classification purposes and why it is needed, and what the basic concepts of classification are.

III. WHAT OPERATING OFFICIALS EXPECT OF CLASSIFICATION OFFICERS AT STATIONS

Walter Mann

A station director expects classification people to see that positions are described to reflect maximum use of the talents of individuals, when the individuals have been assigned such duties and responsibilities, and when such assignments are appropriate to the mission and functions of the Station. He expects the classification officer to take classification actions which are consistent with Civil Service Commission standards. In the Stations the classification officer administers most aspects of the personnel management activity, as well as the Classification Program. Finally, in working with Civil Service Commission personnel management inspectors and reviewers, station classifiers are expected to defend or support their own decisions, and to endeavor to arrive at amicable resolutions of any problems raised.

Operating supervisors - at Stations, as in many other units - occasionally expect classifiers to write position descriptions to fit pre-determined grade levels, to accept unrealistic combinations of duties, and to keep them out of trouble. This illustrates the continuing need for training operating supervisors and employees in the purpose, values, and need for a sound classification system.

IV. SOME INSIGHTS INTO TRAINING OPERATING SUPERVISORS

Charles Petersen

Petersen was a member of the Spring 1959 training group at Washington Office. As one of its many practice sessions, this group divided into small groups for development of responsibility distribution charts as a device for resolving questions raised by trainees. The master chart culminating from this work became the guide line discussed at the beginning of the session. Petersen, as a participant in the project, found it highly educational.

A top staff member at the station recently brought to the classification officer a well-written but extremely lengthy position description. The classification officer complimented the scientist on the position description, but called his attention to the Commission's new policy on length of position descriptions. He did not refuse to accept the lengthy description, but asked the scientist to read the Commission pamphlet, "Less Paperwork in Position Classification". A few days later the scientist returned with an excellent three-page position description, and with appreciation of the Standards of Adequacy propounded in the CSC pamphlet.

Entirely adequate position descriptions can be written by operating supervisors if classifiers are available to provide guidance and encouragement. This responsibility will be accepted by management, if classifiers prepare the way.

Conclusion:

Because of time limitations, the topic was not thrown open to discussion from the floor. Any questions or comments on this topic which may be raised in field units should be referred to the chairman or to the Chief's Office.

LESS PAPERWORK IN POSITION CLASSIFICATION

(Digest)

PANEL: Frank Casanova, Harry Halvorson, and Wallace Otterson

HAND-OUT MATERIALS:
- Less Paperwork in Position Classification (U. S. Civil Service Commission Personnel Management Series No. 15, August 1959)
- Proceedings of Workshop on Streamlining Position Classification Processes (U. S. Civil Service Commission, May 13, 1959)
- Forest Service Personnel Management Circular 58-79, Supplements 1, 2, and 3. K-PERSONNEL - Classification
- Reduction of Paper Work in Position Classification, July 1958 - February 1959

A tool for achieving less paper work in position classification is the Civil Service Commission's new Standard of Adequacy for Position Descriptions. This standard is expressed in a recent revision of the Federal Personnel Manual. Further guidance as to background, intent, related procedures, and illustrative examples of current Commission and agency thinking of this topic are expressed in (1) the Commission's pamphlet on less paper work which had been previously distributed to the field, and (2) the report of a special Civil Service Commission agency workshop on streamlining position classification processes, which was distributed at the seminar. In the Commission workshop, the Forest Service was represented by Perry Hinkelman, Mildred Rasmussen, and Franklin Salzman.

These three documents provide a variety of useful media for conveying the new concept to operating officials and to personnel management people. General guides for application of these new policies at the operating level are now being issued in amended Department Administrative Orders and Forest Service Manual provisions. However, there is a general desire that our practices remain sufficiently fluid to permit study and experiment with the various techniques now available. Following such experience in the use of the new tools, firmer, more specific procedural guides at the operating level may be necessary.

Checklists, amendments, and multi-position descriptions have been found by many agencies to be sound devices for eliminating unnecessary paperwork. A procedure for documenting amendments and statements of differences is outlined below:

AMENDMENT TO A POSITION DESCRIPTION

Procedure:

Prepare a new OF-8, take the new allocation action, and date. Do not change number of new position description. (Change in grade or class is now permissible by amendment if properly documented to show the basis for the classification decision). In Block No. 8 place an asterisk following the date allocated. In Block No. 16 place the footnote "This description is amended by Amendment No. 1 attached". Date _____. (Initialled by classifier)

NOTE: The OF-8 cannot be initialled for an amendment at an organization level below that at which appropriate classification authority is delegated, i.e. a Region cannot amend a GS-14 position description.

Make the same distribution as for the original position description, with instructions to attach new OF-8 and amendment to original description.

Example of an Amendment:

Amendment No. 1

The description of position 7-6541 is hereby amended as follows:

The duties described in the 2nd and 4th full paragraphs under "B. Duties" are performed for Region 8 in addition to Region 7. The 5th paragraph under the same heading is deleted and the following substituted:

"Develops guidelines for serial tanker and other air operations for Service-wide use. Develops agenda and flight patterns for demonstrations of aerial equipment for other regions in addition to Region 7."

STATEMENT OF DIFFERENCES

Procedure:

Since this is a new and different position, an OF-8 is prepared with a new number, followed by a sheet bearing the above statement. These sheets are attached to a verifax or photostat copy of the description for position I-4646.

Example:

"This position is identical to position 1-4646 with the following exceptions: Instead of Duty No. 3, Slash Disposal, which is appropriate for position No. 1-4646, this position has the following Duty 3:

During pre and post-fire seasons and during other periods of low fire danger, serves as a foreman in charge of a small crew in the construction, repair and maintenance of dwellings, lookout towers, cabins, water and sewer systems, bridges, telephone lines and other improvements."

Several conferees stated that a "Notice of Change" form, similar to the one in the green supplement to SAR, would be useful for recording information supporting position description amendments.

Several examples of formats used by other agencies were examined. The merit and shortcomings of SF-75A were reviewed. It was concluded, however, that no servicewide standard format for official position description should be prescribed at this time. However, the Washington Office has distributed a short form which is being used at the Washington office and is recommended for field use. The training and past practices of each Region and Station will be taken into account before one format is selected.

The matter of Washington-field communication came up for lively discussion. This resulted from an administrative misunderstanding in which a routine forms notification had been used at field levels to communicate Washington Office policy on the availability of a new position description outline. As a result of this experience, the group recommended that matters of such importance as position description format should be covered by a formal administrative issuance, such as a circular letter, a temporary directive, or a manual revision.

DELEGATION OF CLASSIFICATION RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY BELOW REGION AND STATION LEVELS

(Digest)

PANEL: Neil Opsal, Charles George, J. William West and Warren Tracy

The delegation of authority to take action must be preceded by (a) conditioning of the operation and the people involved; (b) training and staffing; and (c) provision for working tools and facilities.

The delegations must be on a prescription basis tailored to a specific need. The Service attitude is to be open-minded and receptive to all proposals from operating levels for increased classification authority, but with the reservation that each situation must be determined on its own merits.

No wholesale delegation of technical classification authority below the Region level is now contemplated.

A fruitful field for decentralization lies in delegation of responsibility for procedural aspects such as submission of classification proposals in finished form by trained personnel at the Forest level. Where this has been done, it has resulted in reduction in the time required for the classification process at Regions or Stations, and in more accurate descriptions at the Forest and Research Center levels. Classifiers in such situations are then free to provide services such as training in classification principles for managers, developmental projects, and special attention to problem cases.

The panel members were in agreement and no controversial points were raised. There was little discussion from the floor.

IMPROVING CLASSIFIER RELATIONSHIPS WITH MANAGEMENT

(Digest)

LUNCHEON SPEAKERS: Mr. Clark Stohl, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah

Mr. Samuel Allan, Personnel Officer, Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah

Mr. Leslie Norton, Chief Classifications and Wage Officer, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah

Mr. Clark Stohl, before introducing the two guest speakers, emphasized these tow main points:

It is necessary that the Civil Service Commission and the agencies work closely together at all times.

Although the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, provides for operating departments and agencies to classify positions without prior review of the Civil Service Commission, responsibilities for administering the classification system are shared jointly by the Commission and the departments and agencies.

The Commission and the agencies share the responsibility for achieving sound working relationships between operating officials and management.

IMPROVING CLASSIFIER ATTITUDES

Mr. Samuel Allan

No aspect of the classifier's job is more important than is his attitude toward the operating supervisors and employees who are served and sometimes controlled -- by position classification.

Some types of classifier attitude which when they exist to a pronounced degree, present problems in the classifier's contact with others:

"Gratis-Gladys" - dispenses free advice on every subject; is the doer of everything for everyone.

"Flagpole Sitter" - "Chair Classifier" - or "Headquarters Classifier" - abhors hard work and is reluctant to make field trips or audits.

"Hoof and Mouth Disease" - is carelessly acquired around Government Offices, afflicting victims with the belief that they are omnipotent and that their work is a mysterious and occult act.

"Battling Benny" or "15-Round Finnegans" - battles every issue and defends even weak situations, unlike good military commanders who seek only defensible positions.

"Dream World on Cloud 9" - houses those who believe that their lack of success is the fault of the classification system, the Civil Service Commission or the agency.

Classifiers should attempt to obtain a team approach in working with operating personnel. One way to achieve this goal is to work closely with people in helping them to anticipate their needs, for classification services, so that a Request for Personnel Action (S. F. 52) may be the summation of previous cooperative agreements rather than being the first news the classifier has of what is occurring in an operating unit.

SHARING CLASSIFICATION RESPONSIBILITIES WITH OPERATING SUPERVISORS

Mr. Leslie Norton

A wall poster of a "Stand-Pat Analyst" provided a clever visual illustration of the closed mind, the misplaced tenacity, the over-confidence, the stubbornness, and the illusion of omnipotence about which classifiers are warned.

"Give-away plans" in position classification are those in which various degrees of the classification program have been decentralized to operating personnel.

These give-away plans presumably were adopted to eliminate the "Stand-pat analyst" philosophy in Air Force field classification and wage programs.

I. Most drastic of the plans discussed was the Orlando plan which progressed from classification audits made solely by the classifier to classification audits made jointly by the classifier and the operating official, and then classification audits made solely by responsible, trained operating supervisors.

II. In "the San Antonio plan" operating supervisors conduct job audits with employees as part of the annual position review. The Classification staff audits only those positions which are certified by operating personnel as having changed.

III. A third technique discussed is a systematic plan for decentralization of job classification to the operating supervisor. Procedures for that plan, as it has been established experimentally in a few selected Air Force installations, are summarized below:

"1. Establish positions with well-defined duties and responsibilities. Arrange duties and responsibilities within the organization in such a way as to accomplish the mission effectively and economically.

"2. Duties of an employee may change as the employee is being trained or as he assumes more and more responsibility while gaining experience. This is particularly true in a situation where an employee is initially placed into a "trainee" or "intermediate" level position such as "Trades Helper", WB-5, "Jr. Electrician", WB-10,"Property and Supply Clerk", GS-2. In some situations an employee may be given additional duties as a result of a change in organization or functions. In this case, where an incumbent is involved, the employee should be given the duties until the position becomes well established. When any of these situations occur, the supervisor should study (if he is not already intimately familiar with) the

position descriptions covering his positions. If it is found that the employee's position is covered by an existing authorized job description, the supervisor will take the following action:

a. If the action is a promotion or reassignment action, determine from the Placement and Employee Utilization Technician if the employee can qualify as to the Whitten Amendment and meets the Civil Service Commission qualification standards.

b. Obtain an approval Unit Manning Document change.

c. Prepare the Form 52 requesting the position and personnel action. The action will be processed without the necessity of an audit by the Position Classifier.

"3. If the duties are not found to be comparable to an approved position description in your immediate organization, then the position must be audited by a position classifier who will see that a new position description is written and a title and grade determined. This will be done in accordance with OOAMA Regulation 40-13. The regular procedure to effect the change will then be applied.

"4. In a borderline case, where it is difficult to determine whether or not a set of duties constitutes a new position or an additional identical position, the job analyst can give assistance in coming to a final conclusion.

"5. Job analysts will make yearly audits of all positions in accordance with Public Law and Air Force requirements. Spot-audits will be made as deemed advisable. At the conclusion of these audits a brief written report of findings will be prepared to describe the current situation, and to record an appraisal of how well the program has been carried out by the supervisor.

"6. Advantages of the new plan - greater speed of action - better for the general morale of the employees. - Gives supervisors a greater sense of responsibility for the job classification system. - Gives the position classifier more time to concentrate on surveys and special projects emanating from higher headquarters. - Prevents extended periods of misclassification by assuring prompt attention as indicated above.

"7. Certain principles of job classification which should be understood and applied:

a. A person's position consists of duties permanently assigned and actually performed - not what he might do in the future or hs done in the past. The Government intends to pay only for that which is actually accomplished.

b. Personal characteristics such as age, length of service, marital status, size of amily, efficiency, speed, of work, etc., ar not factors to be considered in determining the proper classification of a position.

c. Job descriptions are not restrictive. The duties desired by the supervisor determine the job sheet. The job sheet does not dictate the duties to be performed unless it coincides with the desires of the supervisor.

d. Sometimes the question arises as to how much time should be spent on the higher level duties. The general rule is that a preponderant (over 50%) amount of time should be spent on the higher grade duties. Where there are two or more positions which are identical (IA) this rule will always apply. Occasionally, in a single position the duty or combination of duties upon which the classification is to be based, although not preponderant as to time, must occupy a substantial portion (approximately 25%) of the employee's working time."

Mr. Stohl concluded the meeting by quoting Leonard White's classic description of the "difficult and hazardous task" of classifying positons correctly in a governmental jurisdiction:

"The correct classification of positions is a difficult and hazardous task. To perform it well requires classification examiners and analysts who are both tachnically proficient and endowed with more than an average degree of social intelligence, since their opportunity to create enmity as well as disappointment is almost without bounds. They must be so eminently fair that even disappointed employees and administrative officers will recognize their fairness; they must possess the impartiality and objectivity of the judge while collecting the evidence and examining the witnesses. They must acquire a knowledge of the organization and functions of the department in which a classification is made comparable with that possessed by most of those employed in the department, as well as a much greater knowledge about corresponding or analogous organization or functions elsewhere. They must have exceptional capacity to get at the facts, to weigh their relative importance, and to reason from them. They must have a government-wide, not an insular viewpoint. Their first loyalty is to the position classification plan and to the Civil Service Commission, but they must also recognize a responsibility to aid the departments to the utmost, within the terms of the law. Their recommendations are likely to be conclusive, but they must guard against the illusion of omnipotence. They require plenty of courage, because their conclusions are likely to be attacked from high quarters; but while they must be steadfast they cannot be stubborn. They must in addition have technical competence: trained ability to write specifications, wide and specific knowledge of occupations, and a thorough knowledge of the general principles and objectives of position classification."

(Introduction to Public Administration by Leonard White, Fourth edition, Macmillan Co., New York, 1955, pp. 363-364)

SALARY AND WAGE ADMINISTRATION

PANEL: Ralph Shull, Roman Pfeffer, Warren Tracy, Al Gammon

HAND-OUT MATERIALS: Guidelines for Conducting Wage Rate Surveys and Establishing Rates of Pay
Outline of Proposed USDA Wage Board Manual

There is a real need for modernizing the system for grading Wage Board positions and setting rates. The Department at the urging of individual agencies including the Forest Service has agreed that the present system is not satisfactory, and that the agencies should develop new wage board system proposals for consideration by the Department.

On this basis the Forest Service representatives agreed and recommended that a ranking system would be most appropriate for our needs at the present time. This would be flexible enough to permit the gradual incorporation into the system of a point evaluation system, similar to that employed by the Army-Air Force, if and when the need for more refinement is apparent.

This proposal was initiated as a result of a discussion with field classification officers who did not feel that the Forest Service situation required the degree of refinement envisioned in the factor comparison point system now employed by the Army-Air Force. Three influencing elements in the decision that the ranking system would be best for the Forest Service at this time were (1) the "fluid" mixed-job nature of Forest Service Wage Board jobs which requires a limited number of broad levels rather than the finely differentiated tasks and levels of production-type jobs in the more massive military departments; (2) the lack of trained personnel to inaugurate, implement and maintain a refined system, and (3) the smaller proportion of wage board jobs in the Forest Service in kinds of occupations and grade ranges in relation to the estimated cost of developing and administering a more complicated system which might be too differentiated, and therefore too inflexable to meet Forest Service needs.

The Region 5 representatives gave an account of their experiences in using the Army-Air Force rates. The region has numerous military installations strategically interspersed throughout its area. Because of this condition, rates may be established within small localities and consequently realistic prevailing rates may be paid for positions within the area. This condition is not present to the same degree in other regions because of the variations in Forest Service working conditions within fairly limited geographical areas. This fact may preclude the Forest Service use of Army-Air Force rates in some regions to the extent that they are used in Region 5.

The Salary and Wage Administration discussion evoked considerable comment from the floor. The final decision as to the course of the Forest Service in this matter was not resolved because the Department of Agriculture retains authority to approve or disapprove any changes within the wage board system. Future meetings have been scheduled with Department representatives regarding the Forest Service's recommendations on revising the wage board manual. The Regional Offices will be kept informed of new developments through regular channels.

HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME

(Digest)

PANEL: Ralph Shull, Roman Pfeffer, Darwin Hendricks

I. HOURS OF DUTY

Ralph Shull

While the responsibility for hours of work and overtime may not now be assigned the regional and station classifier in every location, it is Classification Branch responsibility in the Washington office, and this responsibility may sooner or later be assigned to all classifiers.

We must first understand what constitutes basic standards for hours of duty so that we may know when an exception is involved. The six basic conditions are listed in Departmental Regulations, Title 8, Section 233. Any change in an employee's tour of duty that does not meet one or more of the six basic conditions becomes an exception, and we must be certain there is authority to make the exception.

Departmental Regulations (8 AR 234) list the five conditions under which nonstandard tours may be established. These five conditions relate to the "when" of establishing nonstandard tours and do not relate to occasional overtime. Rather they apply to establishing a fixed tour of duty for several weeks or months. When any one of these authorities is used, a written record of the circumstances surrounding its use must be placed on file and be readily available in the event of a request by the Department for a report. (8 AR 235). Field units have authority to approve other deviations from the five mentioned above, but when this authority is exercised, a full statement of facts must be submitted to the Department.

Ordinarily a daily tour of duty shall not be split by off-duty periods of more than one hour. The Department has stated that we may deviate from this condition in unusual circumstances. As a guide, 8 AR 237 contains three conditions which must be met. Some applicable examples are:

1. A truck driver transports a crew to a work site and then continues to do other truck driving the balance of the day. In such instances it might be best to allow the driver a 2-hour lunch period in order to avoid a violation of the 8-hour law.

2. A cook for a small group of employees out in the woods must prepare the meals before the men go to work and must perform his chores after the men have eaten in the evening. He cannot utilize his time between shifts advantageously for his own purposes, being so far out in the woods. Approval for establishing a split shift for such employees requires approval of the Department.

II. OVERTIME

Roman Pfeffer

Forest Service policy is to restrict excess hours of work to those occasions when the use of qualified employees outside their normal tours of duty is the only practical or the most efficient means of accomplishing a specific job. In all such cases, the responsible work supervisor must be in a position to show that his action is proper and that the need could not have been eliminated by better organization, planning and management.

Two principal types of overtime:

1. Prescheduled overtime - this is overtime, the need for which can be foreseen and plans made to meet such needs.

2. Emergency overtime - this is overtime, the need for which cannot be foreseen, such as in cases of fire, flood or other emergencies involving possible loss of life, resources or equipment.

Delegations of authority to approve overtime have been liberalized to some extent, but important limitations exist in the new authorities. The requirements for documentation of all overtime actions should be studied carefully. These authorities and requirements are presently contained in P.M. No. 58-105 and will be included in the new Forest Service Manual at an early date.

The authorities for prescheduled overtime are now less restrictive than formerly because there now is no specific total time limitation. Formerly the limitation was 90 days in a fiscal year. However, the old policy provided that Regional Foresters could delegate to the Forest Supervisor the authority to order and approve prescheduled overtime not in excess of 15 days on an individual project. This no longer can be done, and all prescheduled overtime must be approved by the Regional Forester or his alternate. Prescheduled overtime, if it is expected to last more than 90 days must be approved under this new delegation, rather than by submitting the request to the Director of Personnel for approval. The documentation must be kept on file to be available as source data for any reports which may be called for by the Office of Personnel or outside agencies. These must be filed at the Regional Office level. Since the Department requires that these reports be immediately available upon request, they must be available in one central place (the Regional Office) rather than scattered among many supervisor and ranger offices. Previously such reports were required to be sent to the Office of Personnel. The decision that these reports may be kept at Regional Offices represents a major advance in the delegation of authority.

"Stand-by" time has two primary requirements:

1. The employee must have been ordered to remain within a certain area by a responsible authority.

2. This arrangement must be for the benefit of the agency.

If these criteria are met, the employee should receive compensation for the period which he is on "standby". The employee would not necessarily be required to perform actual work while in a stand-by status.

"Stand-by" applies primarilv to two different areas:

1. Fire "stand-by" for those regions not electing to emplove the differential system. or for those positions not specifically covered by the differential policy.

2. Emergency "stand-by" for other natural calamities.

Only full-time, year-long employees could be placed on "stand-by" for the second reason above. Seasonal, intermittent, or other like employees could not be ordered to stand-by for this purpose.

III. EIGHT HOUR LAW

Ralph Shull

Discussions with field personnel and reviews of Internal Audit reports indicate that there may be a wide difference of opinion as to what constitutes an 8-hour violation.

There is no means whereby authority may be extended to require or permit laborers, mechanics, and those performing similar duties, to work in excess of eight hours in any one calendar day. The law prohibits such overtime use except in case of extraordinary emergency.

Executive Order No. 7158-A of August 23, 1935 directs us to report all violations of the 8-hour law. The report is transmitted to the local office of the General Counsel for an opinion. If he determines the reported incident to be a violation, the report is sent to the Chief's office where it is reviewed for completeness and then submitted to the General Counsel. The General Counsel in turn transmits it to the Attorney General, who determines whether or not to prosecute.

IV. DIFFERENTIAL PAY SYSTEMS

Darwin Hendricks

Sections 25.251 and 25.261 of the Federal Personnel Manual set up the authority for the differential pay system. Such payments must be approved by the Civil Service Commission. The differential applies to positions which require that a person remain at his work station for periods exceeding his normal daily hours. This is usually in "stand-by status" when no work is being performed. The additional rate of pay cannot exceed 25 percent of the existing base.

The differential cannot be paid if, over a period of time, the compensation is less than would have been received if the person had been paid overtime for hours actually worked customarily required in this position. Neither could the differential be paid if it exceeds premium pay for total hours worked, including "stand-by" time during which no work was performed.

One management advantage to this system is that it is simpler for the rangers who set up the hours of duty, have their personnel immediately available, and can budget finances more closely. The advantage to the individual is that his hours of duty are established and he gets paid for his "stand-by" hours. In the past employees were asked to be available in the area, but did not get paid for this sacrifice of time. The employee now also earns leave on an established tour.

As in all systems, there are some disadvantages. For management, additional records must be kept such as pay and leave, and reconversion of leave when the employee goes on differential and when he goes back to old base. Exception payrolls must be processed manually. Disadvantages to the employee involve (1) possible lowering of his morale because he has little free time to call his own and he must use up his leave when not working during his tour of duty, and (2) possible feeling that the extra hours he actually works are paid for at extremely low rates of pay. Not all men on a fire are on differential and this causes discontent.

In dollars and cents there is probably very little difference in costs over a period of four to five years. The Regional Forester decides whether or not differential will be used in his specific region.

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION AND PAY TRENDS

(Digest)

SPEAKER: Mr. J. P. Findlay, Chief, Programs and Standards, Office of Personnel, USDA

Recent pay legislation has provided little specific advantage for the Forest Service. As far as the Department of Agriculture as a whole is concerned, under P. L. 86-370, the following were realized:

1. An increase of 10 more P. L. 313-type positions.

2. An increase in the supergrade ceiling which resulted in one GS-18; one GS-17 (the Director of Personnel); and two GS-16's. (Other changes reduced the net gain to only one GS-16).

The Forest Service was assigned two P. L. 313 type positions. In establishing these positions certain qualifications of the employee are as important as are the duties and responsibilities assigned.

Feeling still exists at high levels that something has to be done about the pay plan of the Classification Act. The representative of the Bureau of the Budget has supported some change in the pay plan. There is strong opinion that a pay committee should be established to conduct research on the pay system in order to determine among other things, the appropriate relationship (paywise) between supervisory and subordinate positions.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is expanding its pay survey plan for professional, executive, administrative, and clerical positions. Current planning considerations:

"During the past year, an interagency work group, with representatives from the Bureau of the Budget, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Civil Service Commission, Office of the Special Assistant to the President, and the Army-Air Force Wage Board, developed the plan for obtaining data from the surveys for comparison with Classification Act salary scales".

"All recent pay studies have agreed that current salary data obtained form private industry have been inadequate for comparison with Classification Act rates. Now, for the first time, as a result of this survey program, there will be significant data gathered on a systematic basis once each year. These data will be available to Congress in their future pay bill considerations.

Some significant findings on the quit-rate among Army Research and Development personnel indicate that the shortage of professionals recruited between 1956 and 1959 had now eased considerably. The higher entrance rates have reduced the quit-rate from 10.5 to 5.4. The shortages that still remain are in fewer and more specialized occupations.

There were gains in the average grade level in the Department and in the Forest Service. Actually all but two of seventeen reporting units in the Department had raised their average grade levels. Some but not all of these were due to changes in standards.

Miscellaneous comments made by Mr. Findlay:

1. The wage program has to be strengthened and we must improve our wage program. Something practical in the form of a meaningful Departmental policy will be established.

2. The Civil Service Commisson's "Less Paperwork" publication is a good one. Mr. Findlay's comment was "Follow through and do something about this publication."

3. The Commission had made great strides in getting out new classification standards in many occupational groups with which the Department and the Forest Service are interested. The Department plans to modify its own program and organization in standards somewhat, to gear it more appropriately to Civil Service Commission and agency standards programs.

4. The new GS-318-0, Secretary Standard, had proved to be difficult to interpret. Users are particularly cautioned against a purely mechanical basis of determining a grade, such as by organizational level served, etc. A memo will be distributed to the field which is in effect a Departmental interpretation and guideline for the use of this standard.

5. There is a published Civil Service Commission time schedule for new classification standards. Several of these standards apply directly to Forest Service positions, and most are scheduled for review or release within a relatively short time.

HOW TO GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE

(Digest)

LUNCHEON SPEAKER: Mr. Richard W. Maycock, Manager, Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institute, Salt Lake City, Utah

The presentation offered a five point program in ways of getting along with people:

1. Ability to persuade people. Motivate them so that they feel the ideas they present are their own. When they present a point, we must determine what is meant or felt as well as what is said.

2. Ability to be critical in a constructive way. Commend the individual for work well done, before offering suggestions for improvement in weak points. Be constructively critical. On thing to remember is that if we don't call errors to people's attention they have no way of knowing their deficient areas. The tendency is for employees to become weaker in weak areas if deficiencies are not called to their attention, rather than to become stronger or show improvement.

3. Ability to look favorably upon the motives or intentions of others.

   Try to win the loyalty of the employees.

4. Ability to satisfy in people the craving for personal recognition. In other words, "Make me feel important". Temper this to the extent that it is not overdone.

5. Ability to be consistent or fair. Be sincere and courteous under provocation and affable under pressure.

We gain strength in using these five points through a geometric progression. For instance, if we assign an equal point value of 2 to each of the five points and arrive at a total point value through a geometric progression process, it would look like this:

2 - 4 - 8 - 16 - 32

By improving in each of the five points the equivalent of one point, the picture would be changed to this:

3 - 9 - 27 - 81 - 243

Therefore, by improving steadily in each of the areas the results obtained are magnified greatly through geometric progression.

One important thought to keep in mind! By failing completely in one area, you lose everything. Any number of times zero results in zero, and to fall down in one area means to fall down in all areas.

Discussion:

The topic and speaker were received enthusiastically. The points covered were short but meaningful, and the numerous anecdotes and stories were carefully selected to illustrate each particular point.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS AND TRENDS IN RECENT AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS

(Digest)

PANEL: Franklin Salzman and Milton Ray

A review of Civil Service Commission, Department, Internal Audit and Washington Office inspection and audit reports indicates two approaches or attitudes, on the part of the inspectors, toward the people inspected. One is the "human relations" appoach while the other is the authoritarian approach. Perhaps more meaningful terms for these two approaches would be democratic and autocratic. The democratic or human relations terms would be synonymous, as would the terms authoritarian and autocratic. The important aspect of the human relations or democratic approach is the process of winning consent, while the authoritarian or autocratic approach stresses strict discipline and absolute orders.

The human relations approach plays up the positive and good aspects of the program and de-emphasizes the negative aspects to support its conclusions. The authoritarian approach is direct and to the point, calling a spade a spade is more critical, perhaps, but is designed to let the inspector know what's wrong with his program without any sugar-coating. The internal reports, and GFI's, LFI's, and the Internal Audit reports were more in the authoritarian class.

The human relations approach findings were preripheral because (1) these findings are based on readily discernible evidence, and (2) they do not penetrate to the core of the program. Such items as the following were merely surface indicators of difficulty: Inadequate but not inaccurate job descriptions, ambiguous terms, lack of specific information for other than the variety and nature factors, need for time percentages in mixed positions, failure to recognize supervisory responsibilities in titling, etc. In checking more recent reports there is no question but that improvement has taken place in position description adequacy.

Some Commission audits would indicate that we have been lax in tolerating misassignments. In others the results gained from annual position reviews have come up for criticism. For instance the Commission noted that very few of the individual requests for classification action resulted from reports on the annual certificates that position descriptions were in need of attention. Rather, the changes were recommended at other times which is more expensive and less effective a classification technique than the use of periodic organized position surveys. The need is to improve the current method of annual position review to diminish the number of individual requests for classification. Conclusions of the report were to extend the responsibilities of the Forests Staff officers in the area of accountability for adequacy of position descriptions, in order to improve the quality and usefulness of the annual position review.

The Commission suggested that the classification officer participate in staff conferences when reorganizations and the establishment of new positions are discussed. He should provide technical advice in all such planning.

As recently as five years ago the reports reviewed contained criticism of the Forest Service classification program for its conservatism. Recent audits reveal this to be no longer true. Civil Service Commission audit reports have also contained

recommendations that the Forest Service recognize the technician concept more and more in their Fire Control and Forestry Technician series. Another comment made was that most of the benefits of an inspection come from the face to face relationships between the inspectee and the inspector. Therefore, a strongly worded authoritarian report might have a deleterious effect on this relationship and on future inspectee-inspector relationships. In other words, a strict authoritarian approach to inspection reports could result in resistance to the inspection program.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION INSPECTIONS AND AUDITS

(Digest)

SPEAKER: Mr. William Haslam, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Denver, Colorado

The talk was initially focussed on several illustrations of how the CSC Audit and Inspection Program has been of major assistance to field installations in better management of their work force. Most of the illustrations depicted the need for bridging the gap between top management and the work force that exists in the minds of employees in large organizations.

Personnel Management in general and Position Classification in particular plays an important role in the over-all management process. However, these two programs are only as good as the employees, supervisors and the personnel staff make them, and neither Personnel Management nor Position Classification are ends in themselves. They must share their relative importance with other phases of good management.

The Commission's inspection and audit program is established on a firm basis. Civil Service Commission inspections have strengthened the relationship between management officials and the personnel staff. Commission staff members, however, are constantly seeking and adopting improvements designed to make it still more valuable to the various clientele which it serves.

The Civil Service Commission recognizes the importance of maintaining good working relationships with agencies. Their inspections are emphasizing to a greater degree the human relations approach to the inspection program through the leadership and consultant qualities required in their inspection team members and less emphasis on the strict policing function.

Early in 1959, the CSC made a study of its inspection and audit program. They interviewed Personnel Officers, Administrative Assistants, Secretaries in some departments, and other officials in 23 different Washington departments, and 36 field installations, to ascertain what the agencies and field installations thought of the program and to obtain constructive suggestions for improving it. The following summarizes the comments received:

1. Periodic inspections by an outside authoritative source are both needed and desirable. They make practical the broad delegation of authority to agencies in areas where the Commission has a legal responsibility.

2. CSC staff members have a working relationship with personnel programs in all departments and agencies and are therefore able to serve as a source of information on progressive techniques and policies tried and tested elsewhere in the Federal Service.

3. Agencies cannot depend on self-evaluation alone.

4. CSC inspections have resulted in many personnel program improvements, not only locally, but they serve as "feedbacks" from agency field activities to agency headquarters on the application of agency policies and instructions

5. Informal discussions with inspectors are very helpful.

6. Most agencies desire to have the CSC make periodic agency-wide evaluations of their entire agency personnel program.

7. Present sampling not adequate for evaluating the classification program.

8. Less coverage and more concentration on important aspects.

9. Tailor CSC inspections more to the actual needs as currently seen by agency officials, e.g., to pay special attention to positions covered by new standards to see what difficulty classifiers are encountering.

CSC Comments to above:

1. CSC regions are authorized to tailor inspections to program areas where the greatest need for close review is apparent.

2. CSC acknowledges that many inspections do fall short of the depth required.

3. CSC considers the number of appeals and previous inspection reports together with the results of a current review of a sample of position descriptions to determine the extent of desk and supervisory audits to be made.

Formal Inspection Agency with Air Force and Army

In 1957, the Air Force, and in 1958, the Army entered into agreements with the CSC whereby the CSC uses the results of inspections conducted by inspectors representing headquarters of those two departments. In some cases CSC and a Department inspection team join in conducting an inspection. In other cases the CSC accepts the findings of the Department inspectors. These letter inspections supplement previous CSC evaluations. CSC, however, may initiate an inspection any time such is warranted.

Before consumating these agreements, the CSC made a comprehensive review of the Army and Air Force Inspection Program, considering the competency of the Department's inspection staffs, adequacy of inspection samples, coverage of and techniques used, results of action taken on reports, etc.

Joint inspections under the agreements frequently give added weight to inspection findings in program areas where the CSC has no legal or statutory authority, i.e. on administrative matters within the department involved. The agreements also have fostered more interchange of personnel program evaluation data than heretofore.

Nationwide Inspections

Mr. Haslam then described a new plan for systematic nationwide CSC personnel inspections of Departments on a rotated basis. Plans are scheduled with Army, Treasury, Interior, Veterans Administration and GSA. The new systematic plan is designed to keep the CSC present personnel program evaluations on a periodic basis; and also to integrate inspections of field installations, for example, to not only what the CSC wants to cover, but also what the Department wants CSC to cover.

The CSC considers that there are about 15 departments and agencies (including the 5 already under nationwide plans) in which nationwide evaluations may later be made.

OBJECTIVES, PROCEDURES, AND REWARDS OF AUDIT PROGRAM

SPEAKERS: Perry B. Hinkelman and Mary Maxwell

I. CLASSIFICATION AUDIT PROGRAM-SERVICE-WIDE

Perry B. Hindelman

(In Full)

We in the Washinton Office hear a more or less continual rumbling from the field about the difficulty or impossibility of meeting the Department's 25% audit goal. I want to be sure that Forest Service classifiers have a common understanding of three things about the audit program.

First, the percentage of positions to be audited in any organizational entity, according to Departmental Policy is a goal, rather than a requirement. We must realize that this goal has a purpose behind it, and was not established merely to add to the burden of our workload, or for the purpose of helping us to justify size of staff. We in the Washington Office have trouble meeting this objective just as many of you people do, and I will not attempt to make excuses. However, we believe that with our current staffing we can maintain the 25% goal in the future. We will have to adopt the slogan, "The difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes longer".

The second thing we want to agree upon is the fact that the accomplishment of a regular audit plan is essential to a successful classification program. The periodic audit phase of the program is actually the only organized procedure for keeping a classification system current.

We recognize several reasons why our individual position classifications begin to become obsolete - almost before the ink of the classifier's initials start to dry. Probably the most important reason is because positions are filled by people and are supervised by people. People are never static, but always changing, so if the occupant of the position doesn't think of a different way to do some duty, the supervisor will. Some of these changes are minor, but others are significant to the classification of the position. Will the supervisor submit a new position description when an important change is made in the duties? Frequently he won't for the simple reason that he doesn't realize the relative importance of the change. This will be particularly true if the change is in degree of responsibility or method of performance of a function that was already assigned to the position.

I mentioned earlier the number of changes in classification standards affecting our positions recently. We, of course, have to apply the new standards to our positions. We in the Forest Service do not believe that the conforming of individual classifications to standard revisions is merely a matter of paper adjustments. Rather, we think that we need to satisfy ourselves that the revised classification standards are being correctly applied to a position in all significant elements delineated in the standards, even if it is necessary to have a new description prepared.

Other changes in positions stem from the passage of new laws, the adoption of new policies governing an activity at the Departmental, Service or Regional levels, or decisions to change functional organizations or procedures. All of these changes must be reflected in the description and considered in the allocation of the position.

Dr. O. Glenn Stahl in his book, "Public Personnel Administration", draws this analogy between classification administration and highway maintenance. "A road engineer, who was once asked how soon repair crews should be set to work on new highways, replied, 'the day they are open to the public'. So it is with a duties classification -- as soon as it is installed."

Mr. Stahl then recommends that supervisors and foremen be given some training in the elements of classification so they can recognize the need to report changes for action. He concludes that in spite of the most conscientious efforts to keep the classification of individual positions current through these means, that unreported changes are almost certain to occur.

To get back to the 25% audit requirement, you might ask why we should make the sample that size and not some other size. Well, if we audit a different 25% each year, we will cover each position only every four years. Some positions will undergo a lot of changes in that time. And, in actual practice, we will not always cover a differnet 25% each year, for our audit sample will include positions that may have been covered last year - may even have been studied three times in the past few years. Conversely, another position might not be reviewed for six years. Can we afford to do less than this extent of review?

The Seventh Civil Service Region has issued a letter which points up the great need for keeping the classification of positions current. (7th Region Letter No. 58-45). This letter emphasizes the importance of currency from the standpoint of selection of qualified employees. You can think of many other reasons why currency is important. I would like you to notice that the Civil Service Commission indicated that "Cyclic Classification Survey" or "Periodic Audit", should be used as a quality control device and not as the primary means of classifying new positions. We feel the same way -- that is, that the establishment of new positions or the allocations of existing positions should be acted upon as soon as possible after requests are received, without regard to the audit program.

Perhaps we should talk a little here about our definition of "Audit" for I feel from some of your past comments that many of you are defining this term too narrowly. When we speak of "audit", we mean any first hand investigation with the employee and/or supervisor which is sufficient to satisfy the classifier that the position description is adequate and the grade is correct. Besides the descriptions which are selected from already allocated positions for checking, this definition includes those positions which are desk-audited as a part of an initial classification action, reallocation, development or implementation of standards, classification inspection, or merely amendment of the position description. I have a feeling that the use of this definition will help many of you to find that you are meeting or coming close to meeting this program requirement.

The third point I want to make is that it is possible to conduct an adequate audit program within our present staffing. We feel so positive about this because Region 6 has given us an admirable demonstration that it can be done. In the next presentation Mrs. Maxwell from that Region will tell you what they have done in their audit program and how they have done it.

I would now like to dwell on why we consider the audit program an essential part of the over-all classification program. I told you earlier that one reason is that positions are constantly in a state of change, making an orderly plan of review and revision necessary to the maintenance of a current program. The most important reason, however, is that this plan results in the most efficient operation of a classification program. Most of you have many individual requests for classification

action funneling through your office. If you can plan on auditing a segment of your Region periodically, you will find that the number of individual requests will be reduced. This happens because in making your audit you are able to ascertain the number and kinds of classification proposals that the operating officials are considering. Even though their plans are only in the formative stages, you may be able to give enough guidance regarding the implications and possibilities classification-wise to enable the operating people to come to a firm decision. When their needs are anticipated in this fashion, the number of requests for and pressure on individual requests will decrease.

Reduction of the number of special requests also contributes to the efficiency of the classification program in another way. When you classify a single position, you must study its organizational surroundings and the pertinent classification standards. Then when you go on to another position in a different part of the organization you have to repeat this procedure all over again. When you consider positions in groups, your organizational studies and standards analysis can serve for the entire block of positions. This reduces the amount of time devoted to each allocation and also increases the quality of the job you are able to do.

This kind of operation can yield important returns in terms of improved public relations. The operating official is more likely to think that you are serving him, rather than being pushed and shoved, when you are able to review his positions on a more or less voluntary basis. The criticism of some employees that classification does only what it has to -- and when it has to -- can be avoided. These kinds of comments do nothing to increase our prestige or the acceptance of classification with the people who make up the organization we serve.

There are other benefits you will notice as this system becomes operational. For example, your classification actions will become more consistent because of the fact that you are able to study and allocate groups of related positons as a unit. You will probably even find others to tell me about.

Last of all, I want to discuss how these audits should be conducted. The first requisite is a definite plan to audit a certain segment of the organization at a certain time. This schedule should be drawn up well in advance -- six months in advance if possible. Your schedule should be definite as to time and place, but should also allow sufficient spread between audits to leave enough time for handling necessary individual requests, which will occur in spite of the perfection of your procedures. Then, whatever you do, keep your schedule.

The next step is to give notice in writing to the responsible operating official of the fact of the audit, the dates when you will be working in his area, and the information you would like him to have available for you before or during your visit. You should ask him to let the employees know that you will be visiting the organization, the purpose of your visit, a bit about the procedures followed and that their cooperation will be appreciated. If only sample positions are to be audited, particular mention should be made of this fact to the employees so they will not be expecting you to talk to each one in the group. You may be surprised, but many people definitely like to talk to a classifier and feel disappointed if they aren't interviewed when a classifier is operating in the area.

The next step, obviously, is to make your audit as planned. In making desk audits I would like to reiterate one instruction that we all know well -- that is that we must be sure to inform the employee audited of the purpose of our visit so he will not become unduly concerned. To make the audit a service to the operating official, and therefore welcome, we need to cover all problem areas and consider any future classificat

proposals. The final step is to give the responsible operating official first an informal and then a written report. The formal report need not be detailed, but should give a general picture of the status of the classification program in the organization and show the specific corrections required.

Your audit can be organized in several different ways. The most common one is to cover an organization unit, such as a Forest or Regional office division. With the 1959 issue of numerous new or revised classification standards that must be put into effect, you may need to make an audit of a particular occupational group. For example, this type of audit would be appropriate when the new forestry aid and technical standards are issued. Or, you might want to survey positions in certain grade levels as a result of a protest that certain groups of positions are underpaid. If you were undertaking a gross check on the accuracy of allocations in an organization the size of the Regional office, you probably would want to take a random sample. In other words, you may tailor your audit to suit the specific needs in the particular situation.

I would like to mention a by-product of this particular classification program that has a general effect personnel-wise. Most of the other personnel staff members have few occasions to visit the employee at his desk -- particularly if the desk is located outside of the Regional Office. The fact that the classifier visits him, even though it is part of the classifier's duties, makes the employee feel that the personnel office is concerned about him. We all know that the personnel program can be much more effective in an interested and cooperative atmosphere. For this reason the audit program can make a real contribution to the general personnel program.

In conclusion, I assure you that I am sold on the audit program. I hope I've sold you -- and if you conscientiously work at this goal, I'm sure you will "buy" the program, too.

II. CLASSIFICATION AUDIT PROGRAM - AT A REGION LEVEL

Mary Maxwell

(Digest)

Scheduling audits at the beginning of the year to accomplish the 25% audit goal in Region 6 has proven better than unscheduled planning. The method of planning can include assignment to classification personnel either by forest or occupational groups.

The words "audit", "survey", or "inspection" have an unhappy connotation to many people. Region 6 likes to use the term "service trip" in connection with such visits to the Forests. Besides trying to accomplish the audit of jobs, the review of personnel records, and a survey of the organization, Region 6 attempts to convey to the operating officials of the forest the principles of writing job descriptions. We explain what supervisory duties are, what further uses of job descriptions can be made, such as in qualifications and training, and other pertinent points which are only vaguely understood by some operating officials.

Among the items Region 6 tries to "sell" on such service trips is the advantage of a system which classifies positions on the basis of duties and responsibilities and which makes possible a planned personnel program, including recruitment, performance appraisals, promotions, and other personnel activities.

The classification officer briefs himself well before he makes a trip. He studies organization, copies of all position descriptions which he intends to use, and occupational material. He takes the Wage Board Manual, a book of typical position descriptions and the Civil Service Commission standards which might be used on the trip. He briefs himself also by reading previous inspection reports, whether personnel, GII, or Internal Audit. He makes inquiry of other areas of Personnel so that any problem can be taken up on the trip.

Discussion of findings is always held with the Forest Supervisor and the Administrative Officer. In the final report, nothing is included that was not taken up with the Forest Supervisor in the final summing-up. The report is sent out promptly, in about two weeks after return to the Regional Office.

Forest Supervisors are now asking for these service trips.

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION PRACTICES AND PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

(Digest)

PANEL: Franklin Salzman and Harry Halvorson

I. SOME WASHINGTON OFFICE PRACTICES

Franklin Salzman

At the present time the Washington Office is giving priority of classification actions to post audits.

Some of the things the Washington Office looks for in the post audit reviews:

1. General trend of the classification program from a regional and service-wide standpoint in order to meet the requirements of the Commission, Department, and our operating officials.

2. Consistency of internal alignment.

3. Grade-level accuracy in a general way.

4. Appropriateness of series and title used.

5. Miscellaneous items such as general clarity and quality of position descriptions and type of format used, factor treatment.

Washington Office on post-audit is not making any recommendations for grade either up or down. When questions arise concerning grade level, Washington Office asks for the benefit of field thinking on the case. If still not satisfied, Washington Office schedules that position to be fully desk audited at the time of the next LFI or GFI if provision could not be made to do it sooner, or asks the Region or Station for a special report.

When should a case require Washington Office preaudit? The June 1959 revision of the Forest Service Handbook, 6140 did not change the extent of classification authority delegations. It did, by omission, relax some of the previous preaudit requirements.

Under the old preaudit requirements the Washington Office received more cases than it now gets, and was closer to field operations. The additional delegations imply increased trust as well as increased use of control and inspection practices. This is not enough. The Washington Office needs to be better informed of field operations so that it may serve the field better. How can we do this without adding to your burden?

When field offices need advice on particularly difficult allocation problems, they should outline the problems, provide clear and factual background, and describe the specific elements that they wish to have Washington Office advise on or clarify. Reliable advisory allocations are impossible to make, without thorough and complete information provided from the operating situation.

II. SOME FIELD PRACTICES

Harry Halvorson

The field representative on the panel stated that only if agreement cannot be reached between operating officials and the classifier, or if actions could have precedent setting, service-wide implications should a case be submitted to the Washington Office Branch of Classification for advisory allocation. Within their delegated authority, field classifiers are graded and paid upon their responsibility to classify all jobs within their geographical areas. Frequent submission of the difficult, border-line problems to higher authority would be shirking this responsibility and relinquishing a portion of the delegated authority in the regional classification officers position. Therefore this method of resolving classification problems, while permissible and encouraged in highly controversial issues, should be employed with discretion.

Various field offices were canvassed as to whether Regional Foresters or Station Directors desire or should have delegated classification authority. All classification officers expressed the opinion that their Regional Foresters or Station Directors place great reliance on their classification officers and did not wish to have delegated classification authority.

POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS - THEIR INTERPRETATION, USE AND CONTINUOUS REVISION

SPEAKERS: Mildred Rasmussen, Georgia Sherman, Lyman Hicks

WORK GROUPS: Warren Tracy, Charles George, Ernest Harris, Alvin Gammon, Gordon Hutton
Charles George, Ernest Harris, Lela Vaughan
Milton Ray
J. William West

HAND-OUT MATERIAL:
- CSC Bureau of Programs and Standards letter of November 13, 1959, advance copy of Explanatory Memorandum and partial revision of position classification standards for the Secretary Series, GS-318-0
- PM Circular, November 5, 1959, Changes Currently Required to Implement Position Classification Standards issued during 1959, with attachment
- Excerpt, Secretarial Positions (Verterans Administration)
- Chart, Secretarial Positions (Soil Conservation Service)
- Outline, Guide for Review of Standards (Washington Office - Region 4)

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC: THE STANDARDS JOB AT THE BUREAU LEVEL

Mildred Rasmussen

(Digest)

A. Objectives of Standards Work in the Forest Service:

We are committed to use the combined knowledge, experience, and training of classifiers, other personnel representatives, and operating people, in seeing that Forest Service interests in standards areas are protected, and that Forest Service positions and programs are reflected in appropriate ways in standards. This we must do within limitations of time and manpower. The "best standards" for Forest Service positions are those standards that are sound and useful, and that put our positions in appropriate pay relationships to each other. Frequently the standards which meet our needs most are those with qualitative elements that reflect the depth and variety of programs, rather than those which picture only surface elements of size and numbers.

B. Obligations of Classification Officers in Standard Areas:

Forest Service classification officers at all levels of the organization are obligated to schedule the study time necessary to participate in providing whatever specialized aids can be devised that will result in sounder and more challenging career ladders for all groups of positions in the Service, and for all employees who are of the quality that the Service desires to keep.

C. Effort Required in Standards Work:

New standards for personnel specialist position describe standards-development as significant creative research-type work. During the past three years many Forest Service classifiers have participated in the numerous high-priority standards activities conducted by the Service alone or in cooperation with Department, Commission, and other agency representatives. You have found that your standards activities demand intense effort, drive, and perseverance, and a personal dedication and commitment to reach sound and usable solutions. If joint standards projects are to be of value, classifiers and program people must invest time, effort, and attention. Standards work does not encourage superficial solutions. On the contrary, it requires patience, courage, and intellectual curiosity, for it involves piecing together bits of information gathered for various sources and developed under differing circumstances. Only when the distinctions are clear, the guides consistent, and the standard usable, when applied by trained personnel, - only then can the analytical process stop.

Classifiers are encouraged to make greater use of the untapped resource available in high-level program people. Previous education and experience in the particular field being studied - forestry, for example - is not sufficient to qualify the classifier as a subject matter expert for standards purposes. Consultation must come from those who are sufficiently aware of current and evolving program trends, interrelationships, plans, and thinking, so that they may give standards writers the benefit of the perspective of long range program planning.

D. Some Areas of Standards Participation Needing Improvement:

When a region or station is requested to review and comment on a tentative standard, this request is made because the Chief's Office needs information as to field thinking on the subject. The Chief's Office is required to consolidate field comments with analyses of headquarters program representatives, in order to provide the Department and the Commission with comments and suggestions that will represent Forest Service policy. Because of the importance of such comments, we urge that all individuals concerned should take this review seriously. Some kinds of comment that may not be used are expressions of disapproval unsupported by examples, explanations, and suggestions for improvement; quips about Commission standards writing efforts, or comparisons that reflect on other Forest Service units - unless supported by analytical and factual information; and expressions of impatience or surprise at being asked to review or comment on the standards.

Kinds of field comment that have been most useful are those which describe what the effect of the proposed standards will have upon positions in that locality, and support all recommendations with suggested wording or other change.

E. Importance of Classification Standards Work at Field Level:

Classifiers at operating levels of the organization are involved in two kinds of standards responsibilities. They develop guide lines and special aids for use within the local jurisdiction. They also have major responsibility for observing and reporting upon work of selected positions at operating levels, in connection with specific standards studies being made by the Service or higher authority. The data collected, summarized, and presented by the field classifier should provide a substantial basis for standards plans at the Chief's Office level. The adequacy of a standard's coverage will often depend upon the thoroughness of fact-finding and the clarity and soundness of the data submitted by the field classifier. Especially in the review and field-test of tentative classification standards, it is necessary that the Chief's Office rely heavily upon the comments received from field classifiers and operating officials.

F. Future Plans in Standards Work at the Bureau Level:

The Commission has asked that all Agencies and Departments undertaking new internal standards projects notify the Commission before the work is fully underway. This is designed to eliminate duplication and to facilitate optimum coordinated effort. The Chief's Office expects the same type of notification from field units engaged in developmental work in classification and wage areas.

Other reasons for intensified effort in standards activities and for closer coordination with the Chief's Office on standards work are related to the magnitude of standards and techniques projects that remains to be done, before we can feel that tools are completely adquate for operating classification purposes.

Each new standards project is a new challenge to provide positive assistance to the Service and its employees. Standards work requires our best thinking and our fullest efforts, but its rewards are great. No classifier can neglect this opportunity to contribute to the attainment of appropriate standards and guides for all Forest Service positons, while large populations of our positions remain inadequately covered by published standards. All constructive comments on the various standards programs will be welcomed, and if the Chief's Office can provide guidance on any special area of standards, we shall be glad to help.

THE INTERPRETATION OF CLASSIFICATIONS STANDARDS

Georgia Sherman

(In full)

To you experienced classifiers, the interpretation of classification standards probably seems so elemental - so much a part of the daily routine - that you may wonder why we discuss it. We can all benefit from a fresh look at some of our methods. In one case, we are suggesting a slight change in current evaluation procedures. I'd like to discuss a few general matters first, and then illustrate my points by moving into the interpretation of standards for a few specific series.

A. General Discussion of the Interpretation of Classification Standards.

Some classifiers limit their interpretation of standards to the facts as expressed at a given grade level in the standard, rather than using the standards as a basis for a comparative analysis. These people are strict fundamentalists - if it isn't in the book, to be cited by chapter and verse, they accept no responsibility.

In using standards, we should always be conscious of the fact that the standards are drawn around the typical positions in the occupational area. These typical positions must be sufficiently numerous to justify the publication of the standard. In addition, the fact that they are typical means that they are illustrative of the level of work found in a grade.

To do the best classification job, we must consider a standard as a yardstick giving the broad measurements of a grade level. This means that we need to analyze the level, rather than try to compare a position with an illustrative example given in a standard.

To give you an example, the Division of Timber Management in the Washington Office recently divided the valuation and sales administration function, which had been in one Branch, into two branches. The classification standard for the staff option of the Forestry Series describes at the grade GS-14 level the position of a Forester at the national level who has responsibility for formulating and recommending policies and plans covering work in a broad and important segment of timber management such as appraisals and sales.

A literal-minded classifier, as opposed to an analytical one, might say that the combined job is described in the standard, at a certain grade, and conclude that dividing the responsibility weakened the grade value of the resulting positions. But we cannot decide arbitrarily, that this is the case. First, we have to ascertain if the division of work is based on the growth in workload and responsibility, and, if we find that this is so, we must give this fact serious consideration. These increased responsibilities mean that we can no longer refer to the "typical" position which was used in the standard to illustrate the level without further analysis.

We ask what the standard is illustrating by the use of this example. The obvious conclusion seems to be that it is illustrating the level of responsibility of a Branch Chief at the National level. Now, we have to ask if the subdivision of the work, even though the two resulting positions are Branch Chiefs, dilutes the grade value of these positions. You can see that it would require a very detailed review

to establish the precise level of operation of the Branch Chief at the time the standard was prepared and the degree of change in level of responsibility which resulted in the organizational change. Rather than undertake so involved a study, the approach is to measure the new positions against other parts of the standard.

We can conclude, for example, that either one of the new positions would have a greater degree of responsibility and a greater variety of problems than a Chief of a functional program in a region such as described in the staff option of the standard for GS-13 level of the Forestry Series. Similarly, we could safely conclude that responsibilities of both of these positions would compare favorably in grade value with those described for Forester (Land Uses) GS-14 at the regional level. The scope of operations may be more limited, but the responsibilities of a position at the National level would be correspondingly greater. In actually allocating such a position, we would consider the job elements in more detail than we have described here, of course.

The point we want to make here is that we can't use standards as ready-made garments to be fitted to positions without analyzing their significance. It is necessary to determine the meaning and value of each of the factors and the relationship to the position under consideration. To do this, we must first make sure that we understand the level of work which is the basis for the standard for a particular grade.

Please note - in saying that the standard doesn't always spell out the classification at a glance - we are not saying that the standard should be ignored - or that the position should be held down in grade because the organization or other descriptive material doesn't fit a new arrangement of responsibilities. However, we are saying that: (1) The classifier must understand the level of work intended to be covered in a grade by a standard, and (2) he must verify conclusions by evaluating the position against other parts of the standard.

The Chief's office is now protesting two situations in which the Civil Service Commission seems to have made grade-determinations of Forest Service positions without fully considering the relationship of the standard, as reflected by typical positions at the same organizational level, to our level of operation. The positions questioned are our Information and Education Division Chiefs in two regions. The report by one CSC region indicates that the highest grade at which I&E responsibility at the regional level is described in the standards (vintage 1947) at GS-12, but that our position could be allocated one grade higher based on responsibility for serving as an Assistant Regional Forester. In the other case, the CSC region indicated that a grade above that provided for regional positions in the standards could be allowed because of the importance of the program. In neither case do we feel that we were able to portray the complexity and significance of the I&E program to the Commission sufficiently well to permit them to recognize the grade value of our positions compared to the grade GS-12 level regional information position described in the standard.

This brings us to the change in procedure I mentioned earlier. We all have prepared justification statements describing the strong points of a particular position where necessary. We now believe that these justification statements would help you more in supporting your allocations in case of an audit if you would make them evaluation reports. By that I mean that you might take them one step further and include in them your analysis of the grade value of the position compared with the standard. Such an evaluation statement might have been helpful when the Commission audited the two positions discussed above.

Incidentally, in reading some of the position descriptions and justification statements, I have sometimes wondered if we wouldn't have a shorter presentation - in line with the policy for saving paper-work - if much of the factual information were incorporated into the body of the position description. For example, in place of saying a large district, we could say a district covering so many acres. In place of saying a district having heavy use programs of several types, and then describing the broad program in the position description and the detailed characteristics in the attached statement, we could consolidate both program and characteristics information in the description. The Civil Service Commission's standard of adequacy for a position description would certainly indicate that this information should be included in the description - unless it can be cited as being available in charts or other readily available records.

The evaluation statement would then include any narrative discussion which may be pertinent to the allocation, but yet not necessarily descriptive of the particular job. Organizational information is an example of the type of thing that might be covered in this supplement. Also, the statement should include explanatory information that is sometimes necessary to the full appreciation of the value of a fact reported in the description.

The main purpose of this statement, however, should be to make a record of the basis of the allocation. When you classify a position, you take this action because you are convinced that the position meets the standard for a grade level. The basis for your determination may not be readily apparent, however. An evaluation statement -- whether brief or detailed -- gives the reason for your action, and reduces the possibility of an allocation being questioned. These evaluation statements are also helpful in case operating officials question your decision, as they sometimes do by saying, "This job in my organization is as good as a certain other position elsewhere". Sometimes these officials are so sure of the comparison that we have to answer them. If the position was allocated by another classifier, it can be both difficult and time consuming to reconstruct the basis for the grade. An evaluation statement is of immeasurable value in such cases.

Consider briefly the actual process of interpreting classification standards. You are familiar with the instruction that appears in the Commission's introduction to the use of all classification standards, to the effect that you can't consider one position of the standard without reference to the whole in making a final allocation of a position. Yet, no one can deny that standards are lengthy and sometimes quite involved. So I'm sure we all work out some short cuts in our daily work.

Have you ever wondered just how short other classifiers feel that they can cut? Well, I think we all need to review a standard completely at least once, and in doing so, we should mark passages that we recognize as being important in the classification of positions in our organization. This will save time when you next have occasion to use the particular standard. When you are using the standard again, after once having familiarized yourself with its general content, you refer to those portions you have marked, and so far as grade determination is concerned to at least the grade you consider appropriate, and the next higher and lower grades.

Review of the next higher and lower grades verifies your decision. And, if in the process you decide that another grade is appropriate, you of course, verify that determination by again checking the next higher and lower grades.

While you experienced classifiers all have developed a certain "grade sense", and can use this procedure you all have trainees from time to time, and should watch to see that they make a more complete analysis of the standard each time they make

a grade recommendation. When we say "grade sense", we mean that you have developed a basic understanding of levels, and that you apply the standards within the basic frame work of sound classification principles.

The other day I had an interesting experience along these lines. An operating official was assigned responsibility for revising the description of a position which had changed. He had reviewed the appropriate classification standards before he even came to our office for a preliminary discussion. He then proceeded to extract the allocation factors and make a brief description of the grade level.

To conclude this general discussion on the interpretation of classification standards, we want to again emphasize the fact that all of us need to do two things:

1. We must analyze thoroughly the significance of the grade level elements in applying the classification standards.

2. We must prepare an evaluation report when the basis for the allocation of a position is not readily apparent upon comparison of a position description with the class standard.

B. Some Comments About Specific Series.

GS-010-0

Getting back to the Information and Editorial Series, we do have a little more information for you regarding the standards revision proposals.

Mr. George Weinstein, the Civil Service Commission classifier assigned to the standards study, tells us that they have tentatively planned to subdivide the present Information and Editorial Series into six separate series. One of these series is the Technical Writing and Editing Series for which you have already had a draft for comment. The second series to be issued in the Non-technical Writing and Editing Series. Mr. Weinstein is presently working on the draft for this series, and when we last talked to him, he was working on the grade GS-9 level.

He said that he hoped to avoid tying the grades to organizational levels in the revised standard covering general informational work. He feels that grade distinctions should be made on the basis of the program weight - or "what people do", and not organizational level. He also hopes to avoid describing program complexity in such terms as "new, crucial and controversial", when it should be possible to describe why a program is difficult.

Mr. Weinstein discussed the agencies reaction to the proposed draft of standards for the Technical Writing and Editing Series. There were two major comments: (1) The field of coverage should be more specifically defined. He indicated this would be done in the introductory material. (2) Further consideration should be given to the use of project difficulty as expressed in other series as a measure of difficulty. As originally described, a technical writer position could be allocated to the same grade as a designer or researcher who was contributing the technical "know-how" in the professional field. While the technical editor brought both familiarity with the technical field and writing ability to the job, it doesn't seem that his work would be as technical or as responsible as the professional man. This factor will be redefined to provide equitable alignment between the professional positions and technical writers before the standard is published. The Forest Service comments were along the same general lines.

Before I turn the floor over to Regional people who are going to discuss standards you suggested be covered, I want to talk for a few minutes on the revised standards for the Secretarial Series. We in the Washington Office have been watching with interest the disturbance that has resulted from their issuance. You have all received an order to hold off further action under this series. This stop order is being withdrawn by the memorandum which Mr. Findlay has mentioned during this seminar.

Some time ago the Office of Personnel of the Department asked for a listing of the secretarial positions in the Forest Service. The information compiled from your position charts showed that there were relatively few secretarial positions in the field. This is understandable as many of the top clerical positons in the Regions and Stations had supervisory and other duties which pointed to allocation in other clerical series like the Clerk-Stenographer.

If supervision of a clerical force is of sufficient size or complexity to affect the grade or title of the position, the position of the immediate clerical assistant to a Regional or Station official still would not be classified in this series. The reason for excluding such a position under the new standards is that the functioning as a personal assistant to her supervisor in the manner intended in this series would consume too much of the employees time to permit the performance of supervisory work in addition.

On the other hand, the new standard for this series stresses the fact that the deciding factor in a secretarial position is the close working relationship of the the supervisor and the secretary. In classifying clerical assistants to professional staff members, from now on we should check to see if the personal assistant relationship, which is the basis of the secretarial series, is present.

As a result of questions regarding the application of the standard, the Civil Service Commission has issued an Explanatory Memorandum, which you may have received before you came to the seminar. This memorandum discusses this personal relationship in some detail. It indicates that the relationship is not constant, simple or mechanically assessable. It stresses that the existence of this relationship is dependent on the nature of work for which the supervisor is responsible. As some kinds of work afford more opportunities for the secretary than others it also depends on the capacity and willingness of the supervisor to delegate; the size of the organization, as in a larger organization the supervisor may have to rely more on his secretary; the confidence of the supervisor in his secretary; the intelligence of the secretary; her willingness to assume responsibility; and general personality.

The memorandum also makes a point of the fact that the series definition is not intended to limit the use of the series to organizations of any specific size, function, scope, or staff. The only limitation is that the supervisor's position must have responsibility of such nature and of sufficient scope to permit the delegation of secretarial functions.

The published series introduction makes several points of which you should be aware. (1) Secretarial positions need not include stenographic, dictating machine transcribing or typing duties. These types of duties were formerly considered an integral part of a secretarial position. (2) The various duties of the secretary are similar to those found in many specialized clerical series. But the tasks performed by the secretary are considered broader and more responsible because the secretary's participation in the work of her superior requires her to be more aware of

the work of the organization. This in effect means more grade value is attached to these duties. (3) Other clerks in the office may perform some work in her area of responsibility, and her responsibility in these areas is supervisory, but this type of supervisory responsibility is not given any extra credit.

Another interesting point about the revised standard is that the grade levels and duties-concept extend far enough to include secretaries to top officials, like the Chief, which formerly were allocated in the General Clerical and Administrative Series.

According to the Commission's explanatory memorandum, the questions which have arisen about the application of the revised standard mainly result from widely varying interpretations of Element I which pertains to organizational level of the position. Based on reports they received, the Commission felt that the varying interpretations resulted in part from a lack of sufficient definiteness in the language of the standard.

The explanatory memorandum emphasizes that the organization level is not a ranking of the supervisor's position, and that the levels in the standard cannot be equated to levels in an organizational chart. You would not consider, for example, all Division Chief positions at the same organizational level if the programs actually differ in weight. Positions with simlar titles could range from Level A to Level C. The Commission memorandum says most positively that Level A is not to be considered as the last resort to be used only when an excuse cannot be found for evaluating the supervisory position at a higher level. The Commission then emphasizes that neither echelon nor grade of the supervisor is the automatic determinant of the secretary's grade. The scope of the supervisor's administrative responsibility is used to define the potential range of the secretary's duties and responsibilities.

In evaluating Element II, which is the extent of the secretary's participation in the work of her supervisor, the Commission emphasizes that the total job must be considered in arriving at an allocation. The Commission urges caution in the use of Degree IV under this element, as this is an uncommon degree of participation and requires an unusual knowledge of the total operation under the supervisor's jurisdiction.

We have made copies of an article appearing in the Veterans Administration personnel magazine regarding secretarial positions that we though might be interesting and useful to you. We are also distributing a copy of a chart of Element II, the degrees of participation, which was prepared by the Soil Conservation Service. We had also prepared a chart of the allocating factors for the series, but decided to use this one because it had already been printed.

It does seem that more than the ordinary number of questions have resulted from the application of this standard. For that reason we urge caution in its use, but at the same time we do not want you to think that we are discouraging its appropriate use.

The Department is issuing further instructions in a memorandum of November 30, 1959, which is being duplicated and will be distributed to all field offices.

III. POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS APPICATION OF THE GS-456-0 SERIES

(Digest)

PANEL: Warren Tracy, Charles George, Ernest Harris, Alvin Gammon and Gordon Hutton

HAND-OUT MATERIALS: Washington Office letter of November 24, 1959
Region 5 Charts and Statistical Data

The panel members outlined six major points in their discussion of the application of the GS-456-0 classification standards. They were:

1. The effects of the standards on the regions and the number of jobs affected.

Comment:

There has been some general, but not automatic up-grading of fire control aid and technician positions. Most regions have started to implement this standard but with the large populations of poisitons and the wide spread area the implementation has not been completed. It is anticipated that this will be completed soon in all regions.

Washington Office Comment on 1.

A major basis for the revision of these standards was the need to reflect changes in the technical nature of the work, in processes, techniques, tools, and ways of organizing the work. For this reason we believe, and Department and Civil Service Commission representatives have concurred, that it will almost always, if not always, be essential that each existing position be re-described more specifically when the new GS-456-0 standards are applied. This policy interpretation was discussed fully in the Washington Office letter of November 24, 1959, which is cited above as a "hand-out". Regions and Stations are expected to follow the instructions of that letter closely and completely.

2. Problems in applying the standards: - How are they working out? Are you substituting point values for letter degrees as complexity indicators?

Comment:

Only scattered problems have been encountered. For instance, one district ranger complained that his Fire Control Officer should be a GS-7 instead of a GS-9. This was an isolated case and was resolved equitably through further discussion. In general the operating people seem well satisfied with the results obtained by the application of the new standards and the grades in the standards have been found to be equitable.

Of the regions represented on the panel, only one substituted point values for degrees of complexity indicators. They assigend 3 points for each A, 2 for each B, and 1 for each C. Then they agreed that a numerical value of 20 would qualify for moderate complexity, or GS-9, and anything below that would be limited complexity or GS-7. This information was documented and attached to all copies

of the position description. This method has gained great acceptance from the operating people. However, this particular use of points is not encouraged or endorsed by the Chief's office, the Department or the Civil Service Commission.

3. Problems as a result of no provision for GS-6, GS-8, and GS-10 levels in the standards.

Comment:

The regions did not encounter any major problems in this area. There are a few even-grade positions in some regions, but the new Supervisory Grade Evaluation Guide when fully implemented will resolve most of these problems, because most technician positions having problems of this type are primarily supervisory positions.

4. Problems resulting from raising the grades of fire control aid and technician positions without accompanying changes in other related series, such as forestry aid standards.

Comment:

There has been very little dissatisfaction among employees in this area, because the regions have made a special effort to reduce this potential problem by informing their employees that related standards were being revised and were expected to be issued within the near future.

5. What emphasis is given to supervisory responsibilities, personal work contacts, recommendations, decisions, etc., as compared to the complexities of the program for allocation as Fire Control Officers, GS-9?

Comment:

Participating regions presented different opinions on this subject and the consensus of opinions was that each position would require individual treatment and that no standard answer can be given at this time. However, sound principles of classification require and the standards specify that all pertinent classification factors must be considered, and that the quantitative data may not be substituted for sound judgment or used mechanically.

6. Other problems or suggestions relating to this standard.

Comment:

The use of risk characteristics as a grade allocation factor was questioned because it was felt that the instructions for this criteria tend to penalize the good fire prevention job. Potential causing agents should be considered regardless of the number of actual fires. Several participants said that this should be given more consideration. The Fire Control program people, as well as many members of the conference, maintain that the risk characteristics element is a valid factor, when used with the other elements provided.

Another problem discussed was which qualification standards should be used when supervisory factors are involved. A general principle would be to use supervisory qualification standards when the supervisory duties have been a basic consideration in determining use of "Supervisory" in the title and in determining the grade-level. For a more specific reply to the question Mr. Hinkelman stated

that he would ask representatives of the Qualifications Branch in the Washington Office to provide appropriate guidance to the field, since the new qualification standards are currently being issued.

To illustrate further these six points Mr. Gammon explained three charts used in Region 5 to summarize classification element values by districts and forests.

The first chart reflects assignment of numerical values to the grade-level elements of the standard according to degree of difficulty. By application of known appropriate factors these charts permit evaluation of Forest and Ranger District work complexity on a comparative basis.

Region 5's second chart provided a cross-evaluation of districts by comparison of rating of job complexity with a rating of the relative numbers of employees in the fire control organization on each district. Sufficient variation existed to indicate that neither work complexity nor size of organization alone could be used for allocation. All factors must be considered in application of standards.

The third chart provided a cross-comparison of both job complexity and organization size, and produced the grade structure on which allocations at the district level were based. These levels were approved by the Region's fire control division, are considered by Region 5 to reflect the provisions of the Civil Service Commission standard, and thus are being used as bench marks for Region 5 application of the GS-456-0 standards.

IV. POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS APPLICATION OF GS-201-0 SERIES, PART II

PANEL: Charles George, Ernest Harris, Lela Vaughan

(Digest)

Panel members pointed out some of the problems faced by classifiers in finding anchor-points in Personnel Administration Standards, Part II. Among the key factors in this series are (1) difficulty of the problem - analysis required of the personnel management specialist, (2) the breadth and depth of conceptual thinking in diagnosing and positively solving management problems and (3) the broad management implications that are involved in the duties and responsibilities of the personnel specialist.

Obviously the use of conceptually developed standards requires careful analysis and a broad-gauged approach to their application. A charting of these standards for the seminar was not attempted.

The panel recommended and conference members agreed in their desire for further study of the standard on the part of all individuals attempting to use them. It was also agreed that further guidance from Washington Office would be needed for uniform Servicewide appreciation and application of these standards.

Washington Office Comment

This standard is purposely written in broad and general terms. Its stated purpose is to provide basic criteria which may be applied to the various work situations and organization frameworks in the Federal Service.

The following review of earlier, detailed Standards proposed by the Civil Service Commission for these series, this Department and other departments recommended that this standard be revised to provide basic conceptual criteria which would apply equitably across-the-board among Federal agencies. Such a step was considered preferable to standards based upon quantitative elements such as size of population, number of series, numbers supervised, or number of echelons in agency organization. These quantitative elements have been found to be subject to abuse and misinterpretation, and to tend to reward the agencies and departments of greatest magnitude. These elements, in turn, discriminated against widely dispersed, highly technical agencies such as this Service.

The first recommendation of the Forest Service Classification officers following the November 1958 conference, was that Civil Service Commission standards be simplified and broadened in form, to allow for more specific application to fit the organization patterns of different agencies.

A primary feature of this standard which should be welcomed in this Service is that it allows and requires the use of judgment in applying the standard in a particular agency situation. We agree that there is need for further Servicewide guidance to assure a uniform approach to evaluating the various types of strengths in Forest Service personnel jobs. However, we welcome the substantial degree of flexibility that is permitted in agency interpretation, under these standards, and we believe that field classification officers will share this feeling after they have become more familiar with the standards through participation with Washington Office in further study and implementation of these standards.

The field will be asked to participate in the Service guide, by submission of certain factual information and analyses.

V. POSITION CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS APPLICATION OF GS-312-0 AND GS-322-0

Milton Ray

(Digest)

HAND-OUT MATERIAL: Grade level chart of the CSC standards for Clerk-Stenographer Series, GS-312-0 (June 1959) developed by Region 8, Forest Service
Grade level chart of the CSC standards for Clerk-Typist, GS-322-0 Series, (June 1959) developed by Region 8, Forest Service

Clerk-Stenographer GS-312-0

Careful consideration is necessary as to whether the ability to perform stenographic or reporting work is the paramount qualification requirement. Some rules of thumb which can be applied to many positions to decide whether the positions belong in this series are:

1. Positions which consists solely of stenography or reporting.

2. Positions in which stenography or reporting is the highest grade duty.

3. Positions in which the clerical work is of a general or mixed nature not requiring specialized experience or training.

Excluded are positions where:

1. A qualified stenographer is not required.

2. Positions classifiable in the Secretary Series GS-318-0.

3. Supervisory positions over positions in this series, when the supervisory position does not require stenographic ability.

4. Positions which require a qualified stenographer but for which specialized training or experience in specific clerical work is the paramount qualification requirement.

Grade levels are determined by the following factors:

1. Nature and variety of work.

2. Guidelines available.

3. Person-to-person work relationships.

4. Supervisory control over the position.

The characteristics of shorthand work as related to grade depends upon difference in degree of skill or speed required, extent of vocabulary knowledge and subject matter familiarity, nature of terminology encountered, and the level of responsibility involved in the work situation.

Grade levels for clerk-stenographer positions in the Standard describe in detail the stenographic work, but the clerical duties should be evaluated as to grade level by reference to the appropriate standard for the clerical duties involved.

Clerk-Typist GS-322-0

Consideration must be given as to whether the ability to type is the paramount qualification requirement. Included in this series are positions -

1. Which consists solely of typing.

2. Where typing is the highest grade duty.

3. Where the clerical work is of a general nature not requiring skills of other than a general clerk type.

Excluded are positions -

1. Where a qualified typist is not required.

2. Positions classifiable in the secretary series.

3. Supervisory positions over positions in this series, where the supervisory positions do not require typing ability.

4. Where a qualified typist is required but for which specialized experience or training in specific duties is the paramount qualifications requirement.

VI. SUPERVISORY GRADE EVALUATION GUIDE - PART I

J. William West

(Digest)

HAND-OUT MATERIAL: Supervisory Grade Evaluation Guide - Part I

The Supervisory Grade Evaluation Guide- Part I is applicable to positions of supervisors of work properly classifiable at one grade intervals, where the supervisory positions meet the coverage criteria within the guide, unless the positions are specifically covered by separately published supervisory standards.

To qualify, the position must:

1. Meet the minimum level of supervisory responsibilty as defined in the standard.

2. Not exceed the first level of full supervisory responsibility as outlined in the standard.

Evaluation of supervisory positions is based on four factors:

1. Grade level of work supervised.

2. Kind and degree of supervision exercised.

3. Scope and variety of operation supervised.

4. Special additional responsibilities.

Each factor, except factor I, is subdivided into three key elements:

1. Work planning and organization.

2. Work assignment and review.

3. Supervisory personnel functions.

These elements determine whether the position qualifies as a supervisory position. If the position meets the lower level for each of these three elements it meets the "Minimum level of supervisory responsibility" and the minimum grade of the position will be at least one grade above the highest level of basic work supervised.

Discussion

The discussion period brought up several questions regarding the application of the guide which will beclarified by Washington Office policy issuances. These questions include:

1. May more than two levels of supervisory responsibility be evaluated by this guide?

2. Does a position have the full level of responsibility if it cannot meet full and final technical responsibility?

3. What is the correct interpretation of the first paragraph under "Exclusions" page 16, regarding the number of employees supervised?

4. Can the guide be applied to professional supervisors who are supervising employees in one grade interval lines of work?

VII. GUIDE LINES FOR REVIEW OF TENTATIVE STANDARDS

Lyman Hicks

(In Full)

Mr. Hicks discussed his participation with Washington Office classifiers in reviewing, analyzing, and reconstruction of the Forest Fire Control Aid and Technical Series standards, GS-456-0. He followed an outline for such a review which had been originally provided in a Washington Office training session for classifiers and which had been modified and developed in several areas by Mr. Hicks. The outline follows:

Guide for Standard Review, Analysis and Reporting

I. Reviewing.

This section is designed to be used as a checklist in reviewing proposed drafts of standards.

A. Read tentative draft of standards through. Read the draft through to become familiar with its organization and general content. Do not attempt to become too critical the first time it is read so that an overall perspective can be maintained.

B. Read tentative draft of standards by parts to determine:

1. a. Clarity - Does the draft leave doubts as to what is being discussed? Do definitions adequately cover the terms used in the draft? Is a discussion of the work processes involved discussed? Should they be?

   b. Consistency - Are factors in introductory material indicated to be significant, present at the various grade levels? Are grade levels in the draft consistant with those in other published standards? Will problems arise in your area as a result of such inconsistencies?

   c. Completeness - Is the draftin such a form that your positions may be evaluated? Can you see your positions in the draft? Is additional explanatory material necessary to include our positions? Does the draft leave doubt as to various work processes involved?

2. The extent the tentative draft of standards effects the region or station. How many positions are involved? Are the positions servicewide or local? What financial impact will the standards have? Does the draft affect more than one agency? Does the draft provide the relief anticipated?

3. Series definition.

   a. Comparison with present series definition - How does it differ from existing definitions? Is the definition adequate for the series coverage? Are omissions critical for your positions? Is the nature of work clear and understandable?

b. Inclusions - Are there sufficient inclusions to cover your position? Are they clear? Are there ambiguous terms used where doubt might exist about the inclusion of your positions? Are there obvious omissions that would exclude some of your positons? Are the inclusions phrased properly so that professional, non-professional and clerical positions only are included, as the case may be?

c. Exclusions - Is there sufficient coverage so that professional, non-professional, clerical or ungraded positions are excluded, as the case may be? Does exclusions cover similar types of work? Is there repetitious material covered in the inclusions? Is research distinguished from other type positions? Are supervisory positions excluded? Are the exclusions clear, leaving no doubt as to what they are?

d. Comparison with related series definition - Is the series definition so worded that it covers the field of work for which it was developed? Are there conflicts with other series definitions? Is the definition worded so that it covers more than the field of work intended?

e. Relationship to classified or unclassified positions, professional or non-professional positions, etc. - Does the definition have sufficient inclusions or exclusions to clarify such situations? Does the possibility exist for coverage of non-professional positions in a professional series and vice versa? Is there sufficient explanation of the various types of closely related positions?

4. Effect on Organization Structure.

Chart typical job relationships in the organization. Apply relationships existing to provision of the standard for each specialization. Are the relationships evident? Are your positions clearly definable in the relationships that exist? Are there progressions of grade patterns to fit our organizational structure?

5. Occupational Information.

a. Timeliness of occupational coverage - Does the occupational information cover your present positions? Future proposed positions? Is it broad enough so that the information may be projected? Is it restrictive to present or past practices?

b. Validity - Is the information established on a sound understanding of the field? Is the information on a broad general basis or a narrow restrictive basis as may apply to a single agency?

c. Completeness - Does the information cover the entire procedure or is it restricted to segments of the overall process? Is the occupational information described in detail? Are your type positions described in sufficient detail?

d. Effects on your occupational coverage - Are your occupations properly covered? Does the draft split your work fields? Are there provisions made to cover that portion omitted? Should there be? Is it difficult to determine what series your positions will be in?

6. Program Information.

Does the scope of your program reflect in the standards? Is it adequate? Is the program directed toward one agency? Does your program reflect in the various specializations as well as in the various grade levels?

7. Classes.

Are the classes adequate? Are provisions made for your classes of positions? Are they all inclusive? Are there provisions made for "generalist" type positions?

8. Grade Level Indicators.

Chart indicators as given in introductory material for the various grade levels. Are they consistant? Are they omitted in the grade levels? Are the indicators used real? Are they measures of the difficulty of the work involved? Do they show program complexities? If numerical figures are used, do they reflect difficulty of the work? Is the range of values realistic? Do they produce desired results?

9. Grade Levels.

Are grade levels consistant with other standards or where precedent patterns have been established? What effect will the standards have on the morale of employees? Do grade levels extend to cover your needs or are there provisions for projection?

II. Rewriting.

A. Determine elements or parts of the draft which make the draft unsuitable.

This is determined through a review and analysis of the material and data obtained under Part I above. Certain elements or parts of the draft may be totally unsuitable; others undesirable, but would be acceptable if amended; others undesirable but would not be catastrophic if unchanged and; others may be totally desirable and acceptable.

B. Prepare Substitutions.

Once the critical areas of a draft are determined, the next step is to determine what is necessary to make them acceptable. In cases where wording is a problem insert proper wording to cover your position. In cases where elements are used in conjunction with a numerical scale, determine that the elements contain applicable and measurable elements. Additions may sometimes be added by an "or" situation. In some cases it may be necessary to adjust the weights given various elements. The range of total elements may be adjusted to bring your positions in line with what they should be. In some cases key words or phrases may change the entire meaning of a section or paragraph. In cases where restrictive language is used, amend the words as needed to obtain the desired language. If your program is not included and cannot be interpreted, write it in.

C. Test on Known Postions.

After the changes you have deemed necessary are made on the draft, test on positions in your ogranization. Do not take just one or two positions from the same area but select a cross section of positions in every organizational level where they may be found. Document results of each position. Identify positions evaluated.

D. Evaluate Results.

Once a representative cross-section of positions have been evaluated by the revised material look at the overall results. Do all positions evaluate at the level deemed appropriate? If so, this sectionneed be carried no further. If not, look at the group of positions to see where the discrepancies consistently occur.

E. Adjust Criteria if Necessary.

If areas can be determined that consistently produces undesired results amend these areas to be acceptable.

F. Test Again on Known Positions.

These positions should be the same ones as used in Item C above. Identify and document positions evaluated.

G. Re-evaluate Results.

This procedure is the same as contained in Item D above.

III. Group Rating.

A. Detemine and contact divisions concerned to explain standards and obtain rating assistance.

This procedure is particularly important to familiarize Division concerned with classification standards that affect their positions.

B. Have each individual rate the positions in the area.

Explain the significant factors or elements in the rating procedure to individuals doing the rating. Explain why their positions are being rated. Answer any questions that may arise.

C. Evaluate Results.

Review each individuals' rating. See if desired results were obtained. Look at the overall picture of the ratings. Were the raters consistent? Were there areas where undesired results were consistently obtained? Were some inconsistencies the result of interpretation? If desired results were obtained, this step need be carried no further.

D. Amend Elements as Needed.

If undesirable results were obtained from certain elements, amend by changing wording, changing point values on the total spread in ranges. Individually test again for results.

IV. Letter Comment.

A. Supply copies of standards to divisions concerned.

The divisions are vitally concerned with the issuance of new classification standards for many reasons. They may solve existing inequities in pay providing higher grades; costs that may be involved; grades may be reduced; administrative decisions that may be involved; morale problems that may be created or solved; and general knowledge of what to expect gradewise for future organization structure.

B. Schedule conferences to obtain operating officials viewpoints.

The operating officials are the technical specialists in their subject matter field. In all cases the operating officials are not well versed in classification standards but they do know their programs. If they do not agree with the subject matter content of the draft, determine what their objections are. Take prolific notes on every phase of such discussion. Determine through questioning what may be acceptable substitutions. If necessary schedule additional conferences after you have made suggested changes.

C. Outline Letter Comment.

This outline should generally follow the organizational structure of the proposed draft. However, it may be desirable to omit certain sections if there is no comment to be made. A general statement about the standards should be included at the beginning of the letter with a general summary at the end.

D. Indicate what is desirable, undesirable and what is recommended.

This phase is taken from Parts I, II and III above. It should be condensed into usable form yet long enought to explain the problem and your viewpoints. Reference should be made to attachments where applicable.

E. Clear with Divisions Concerned.

This should be done so that the divisions are in agreement with your form of presentation as well as the subject matter content.

F. Submit letter comment with work sheets, notes or substantiating material.

In cases where supporting material is developed, it should be sent to the Washington Office with your letter comment. This supporting information is extremely valuable to the Washington Office since local data and figures are not available at that level.

SECURITY IN INDUSTRY

(Digest)

LUNCHEON SPEAKER: D. H. Troupe, Security Officer, Marquardt Corporation, Ogden, Utah

We are in a great struggle for national survival. Whether America survives or succumbs to other ideologies depends largely on maintaining security. We must regard the struggle for a free world as a matter of life and death and security is an important element in that struggle.

There are forces at work in this country which endanger the security of the Nation. The existence of subversive forces has led to the establishment by industry of security programs for the protection of research and development against espionage. It is in the research and development field that espionage agents are concentrating their efforts because it is in these areas that technological advances occur. However, natural resources are also among the biggest targets of espionage agents.

The industrial espionage agent is an industrial expert as opposed to the popular concept of the "cloak and dagger" type operator. Two categories of agents are sent to control the espionage network -- legal and illegal. The legal agent enters the United States as a representative of his country. He works under diplomatic protection. The illegal agent enters the country in various ways. He does not have the protection of his country and if he is apprhended his country will deny any connection with him.

Industrial security today is designed to protect research and development as well as physical plant facilities. However, that is not enough protection against espionage since spies may actually work within the plant itself and produce goods while secretly carrying out their espionage activities. For security programs to be successful, the understanding and cooperation of each employee is required. We need educational campaigns to prevent as well as to suppress breaches of the nation's security.

Modern management now accords professional status to individuals handling security activities.

KEY PROBLEM AREAS OF SERVICEWIDE INTEREST

(Digest)

PANEL: P. B. Hinkelman, Chairman; Mildred Rasmussen, Ralph Shull, Georgia Sherman, Franklin Salzman, Warren Tracy and Harry Halvorson

GUEST PANELIST: Joseph P. Findlay

Problem No. 1

One region has a problem in obtaining sufficient information on organization of work and functions of individual units to properly classify positions. Frequently they find that organization charts are in conflicts and not coordinated with classification charts and position descriptions. They think there is need for some standardization in methods for this type of work to define level of responsibility and to remove conflicts between organizational entities.

Discussion:

Mr. Hinkelman proposed that the Washington Office Branch of Classification discuss the problem with the Division of Administrative Management so that a temporary directive can be issued to clarify responsibilities for notifying the classification office or organizational changes.

Problem No. 2

Discuss the classification officers place in appeals.

Discussion:

a. Each classification officer should be familiar with appeal procedures.

b. Appeals should not be discouraged but neither should they be encouraged.

c. Employees should be notified of their appeal rights. Each employee should have a copy of the Employee Handbook which gives employees sufficient information on appeal rights and procedures. This handbook should be given to all new appointees.

d. Employees should be notified that it is to their advantage to appeal through channels which leaves the door open for higher appeals if necessary.

Problem No. 3

It is suggested that we try to achieve greater uniformity in establishment of position titles for series and grades not provided by standards.

Discussion:

Submit recommendations for titles to Washington Office if this is a major problem in the field. However, we do not want to get our people into an inflexible position; and only real problem cases should be submitted.

Problem No. 4

We believe there is need for analysis, discussion and clarification of inclusions and exclusions intended in tentative standards Technical Writing and Editing Position GS-010-0 sent out with Mr. Hinkelman's memorandum of September 16. Our viewpoint was stated by memorandum (6140) dated October 19. We accept classification standards, but are concerned that maximum grade level is GS-12 for professional people with formal education equal to our Research Forester and others in the Biological Sciences. It would be helpful if types of positions and qualification requirements intended for GS-010 and GS-0XX could be keyed out.

Discussion:

In response to the agencies comments, the CSC plans to define and clarify the field coverage for these standards further. Specifically, they will amend the introductory material to outline the role of the technical writer and editor, the non-technical writer and editor and the subject-matter person who does some writing.

Also under CSC consideration is the concept of measuring work difficulty by reference to the project difficulty expressed in other series. As now designed, the standards provide for the technical writer position to be allocated at the same grade level as the originator of the technical idea. In Forest Service comments to the Department, we questioned whether a technical writer (or editor) could make the same degree of contribution to a project, or would be required to apply the same degree of skill as a professional man actively engaged in research, design, testing or other professional assignments. Before publication, the Commission states this provision will be modified.

Some units have expressed a concern that the maximum grade level is GS-12 for these "college calibre people". These standards do not preclude the possibility of higher grades for individual workers or supervisory program people. While we do not foresee the use of higher grades now, we are not bound to a GS-12 limit.

It is now proposed to subdivide the present Information and Editorial Series, GS-010-1, into six separate series, two of which will be the Technical Writing and Editing Series and the Non-technical Writing and Editing Series. A memorandum discussing the subdivision of work now included in 010 has been prepared for Commission use.

The agencies reaction to the proposed draft of standards for the Technical Writing and Editing Series was discussed with the Civil Service Commission representative. There were two major comments. (1) The field of coverage should be more specifically defined. The Commission representative indicated that this would be clarified in the introductory material. (2) Further consideration should be given to the use of project difficulty as expressed in other series as a measure of difficulty. As now designed, the standard provides for the technical writer position to be allocated at the same grade level as the originator of the technical idea. Before publication this provision of the standard will be modified. The Forest Service comments generally conformed to the objectives.

Problem No. 5

A number of offices asked that the relationship of the Information and Editorial Series, GS-010-0 and the Forestry Series, GS-460-0 be explored. It was also suggested that the relationship between 201 and 303 and 460 in the Forest Service be treated also.

Discussion:

To answer this problem Mr. Hinkelman read the following prepared statement:

This is an area which in recent years has troubled all of us. I think that in view of this that all of you should have a better understanding of how we view this situation.

As most of you know the old Forester Standards authorized us to place 010, and 201 type of positions in the 460 series. In the new Forestry Standards this authorization was deleted - the Commission's thinking being that if the position required primarily informational skills and knowledges it be classified in 010 or if the position required forestry skills and knowledges it be classified in 460.

We have placed our top Regional I&E Division Chief positions in the 460 series based on his ARF duties. I admit that this basis is not too strong because the Engineering and Fiscal Division Chiefs have these identical ARF responsibilities and the incumbents of these two positions in most cases are not foresters. So, you may ask why we are putting these jobs in the 460 series? The answer is threefold: first, it has been the Chief's policy to keep these positons in the Forestry Series - not so much because of the ease of movement into these jobs but more because of the ease of movement out of these jobs into forester jobs - as for example, the Regional Forester position; second, is one of expediency - and that is keeping these positions in grade levels consistent with other positions which I know to have comparable complexities and responsibilities; (this is an important responsibility that I am charged with - and if using the forester classification is not the strongest technical argument - it did help the Forest Service achieve grade-level equity which is our most important end product) and third, the practical considerations - our Forest Supervisors, for example, have line responsibility for Personnel Management and Informational work - they always have and always will - therefore, the movement of a Forest Supervisor to an I&E Division Chief to a Regional Forester all within the 460 series is logical from a career standpoint. However, engineers and accountants who because of the nature of their operations and lacking line responsibilities, have less opportunity to perform the same type personnel management and informational duties and therefore have not been considered a primary source for I&E and P. M. Division Chiefs and since the positive educational requirements prohibit engineers and accountants converting to foresters the only logical classification for them is in the 800 or 510 series.

Well, what does all this mean? It means we have a long-range as well as an immediate problem. The long-range problem is to show top staff that others as well as foresters can fill these Regional Service Division Chief positions. I have a personal stake in this because some of you are not foresters and I am dead serious when I say I want to provide all of you regardless of academic background with as high a career ladder as possible so that you can go as high as your abilities will take you.

The other aspect is the more immediate and urgent problem and that is of retaining present grades for these positions. So until the new standards give us any relief we will still use the forester concept. As to the understructure, where a job clearly requires forester skills and knowledges keep them in 460 - where they don't, you will have to use the appropriate series such as 010, etc.

As we attack and make progress with both the immediate and long-range aspects of this problem we will keep you completely informed.

Problem No. 6

The problem is whether positions involving the hydraulic and hydrologic aspects of a watershed management program are allocable to the Hydraulic Engineering Series (Hydrologic Investigations specialization) or to the Forestry Series Part II (Watershed Management specialization). The criteria for allocation to the Hydraulic Engineering Series appears to be summed up in that part of the Classification Standards (GS-813-0) which states:

"...are included in this series when they constitute the means toward an engineering objective, and are an integral part of and bear a direct relationship to the successful development of a hydraulic engineering project..."

"It is recognized and emphasized that hydrologic studies, similar in kind to those indicated in the preceding paragraph, may also be performed (a) as part of other fields of work that are not of an engineering nature, and (b) for purposes other than engineering purposes, for example, in flood forecasting, soil conservation, range and forest management, etc. In these circumstances, positions involving such hydraulic studies are not allocable to the Hydraulic Engineering Series, but may be included as parts of other appropriate series..."

We have position allocated to the Hydraulic Engineering Series involving projects, the ultimate objective of which is watershed management on range and forest lands. Our classification officer is of the opinion that these positions are properly allocable to the Forestry Series Part II, Watershed Management specialization.

Discussion:

This is a qualifications problem rather than a classification problem.

There is no minimum educational requirements for Hydrologist. It is important that the employees' profession be recognized and that he be retained in his profession if at all possible.

Problem No. 7

We should consider (1) Role of position classification in the selection of qualified employees; (2) Use of performance standards and training plans in classifying positions.

Discussion:

(1) Classification determines qualification and vice versa. Mr. Findlay stated that it becomes more and more important that there be a close correlation between classifiers and qualification people.

(2) The W. O. is studying a new system for performance evaluation and hopes to be able to develop a plan to be submitted to the field for review. Any suggestions, references or other pertinent material on this subject will be welcomed by the W. O.

Problem No. 8

One region expressed interest in having both the classification and career ladders for Nations Forest Administrative Assistants and Officers positions discussed.

Discussion:

The Washington Office is considering the development of a career ladder for National Forest Administrative Assistants and Officers. Career ladder charts which were prepared in 1956 are proposed for revision.

The tentative draft of classification standards for the Administrative Assistant and Officer series issued by the Commission has been temporarily suspended. The CSC lost the man who was assigned to this project and it was a problem to find someone with sufficient knowledge and background to complete the study. It has been assigned to Mr. McKean and it is hoped that he will complete the project in the Spring or Summer of 1960.

Problem No. 9

The publication "Classification in a Nutshell" has been received in revised form. Has the film strip and phonograph record been revised?

Discussion:

It has not been revised. Mr. Findlay stated that while "Nutshell" is shopworn, the message is still there. The original production cost about $7000 and it meets the needs of non-technical people, therefore the Department in not planning on revising the film strip or the phonograph record at this time.

Problem No. 10

Another problem which we feel needs discussion is how regional classification officers can help the Chief's office classification staff improve classification correlation with the Chief's office resource divisions. Within the past year, two classification actions have been prepared by the Chief's office resource divisions and apparently these were not correlated with the classification staff. One dealt with the classification of scalers. This problem has not as yet been solved. It apparently can be if the new forestry aid specifications will be approved as written.

Discussion:

The operating official has the right to propose jobs, but they should be cleared through classification first.

One Regional Forester issued a memorandum to his division chiefs to clarify this very point. It stated:

"We are finding that occasionally we get into difficulties as a result of divisions corresponding directly and unofficially with their Washington Office counterparts. Some of this correspondence is undoubtedly in order, but I believe we should keep it to a minimum. In order that we may have full correlation of such messages, I would like each of you either to give me a copy of your unofficial communications or discuss them with me in advance - if not in advance, as soon as the opportunity is afforded after they have been written.

"On occasions you may get unofficial correspondence directly from the Washington Office. In such cases please be sure to discuss with me any action suggested. Official correspondence sometimes comes from the Washington Office addressed directly to divisions or individuals. Such mail by-passes the Regional Forester's Office, and I would like to have you in every instance advise my office of the receipt of such correspondence and the nature of it.

Problem No. 11

Suggest we discuss the need for a development plan to qualify Range Conservationists for the GS-460-0 Series in Region Two. In one sense this is not a classification problem; but neither can it be completely divorced. We need a development plan to qualify a few individuals who lack only one or two forestry subjects to qualify for the GS-460-0 series.

Discussion:

This is a qualifications problem and has since been resolved by the issuance of new qualification standards.

Problem No. 12

The interpretation and application of the technician concept as described in D.C, 904 and other instruction concerns us. This has been the subject of two classification seminars in the Portland area but the Commission has not given us a satisfactory or specific answer to our problem.

Discussion:

The technician concept as contemplated for use in the Forest Service was outlined in several Washington Office letters. The new Fire Control Aid and Technician standard has a good definition on the distinctions between professional and technician positions on pages 7 and 8. CSC introduction to standards for the GS-800-0 group also discuss this concept in detail.

Mr. Findlay indicated that some of the technician concepts grew out of manpower utilization concepts. The use of the technician concept is a way for classification to serve where manpower utilization could not. There was and still is a manpower shortage of professional people and it is necessary to utilize the professional skills at their maximum by letting the technicians perform duties not requiring full professional knowledges.

Problem No. 13

The problem of setting up a "regraded" position versus establishing a new position. Refer 8AR, Chapter 6, paragraph 62 h. - Classification Action. The use of the regraded procedure has special significance in view of Paragraph 169 in Title 8, "How to Compute a Longevity Increase" since creditable service in lower grades is creditable where a reallocation (regrading) is involved, as we interpret the instructions. Specific mention is made of the effect on lookout positions.

Discussion:

Participants had been concerned about a ruling that an employee whose position is reallocated to a higher grade without change in duties may include period of service in the lower grade in determining creditable service in the higher grade toward the 10 year aggregate. This applies even though the employee is subsequently assigned to a different position. This provision should not be confused with the classification principle that a position to be classified under new standards must almost always be redescribed to reflect the pertinent new grade-determining elements upon which the new classification decisions are based. Otherwise it is questionable whether there is demonstrated basis for a different classification. This applies especially to changes resulting from application of professional and technician standards and all others where new classification standards are based directly on intensified job complexities and technical requirements.

TWO PROFILES IN ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

(Digest)

LUNCHEON SPEAKER: Dr. J. D. Williams, Professor of Political Science, Institute of Government, University of Utah

Dr. Williams changed his topic heading from "Administrative Qualities Desirable in Leaders" to "Two Profiles in Administrative Leadership", so that he could use the "case study" method of presentation to illustrate his discussion. He indicated that in his opinion there was a very close relationship between administrative leadership and desirable qualities of those who are responsible for position classification.

The two profiles which he presented as illustrative of administrative leadership qualities were of those two prominent individuals, Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, and Dr. Ernest Stacy Griffiths, formerly Director of Legislative Reference with the Library of Congress. Dr. Williams described these two men as outstanding and complex personalities.

The chief qualities which made Mr. Ickes a great leader were:

1. Foresight - the ability to see events coming long before they took place.

2. Loyalty to Subordinates - didn't throw subordinates to the wolves because of a mistake. Ickes accepted the balance for subordinate's errors, and discussed these inefficiencies with the employee in private.

3. Pointed Speech and Sense of Humor - pointed speech invaluable to intelligent communication. A sense of humor is a great relaxer of tensions in different situations.

4. Honesty and Incorruptability - his conduct of the WPA program especially pointed up his high ethical standards.

Dr. Williams stated that when he accepted his first Federal position he carried a preconceived stereotyped image of what Federal supervisors in Washington were like. He found Dr. Griffiths to be the diametrically opposite to this preconceived idea. He was a Rhodes scholar, and alive in every sense of the word.

1. Ability to Convey a Sense of Mission to His Staff - each staff man knew that his was a vital job.

2. Loyalty to Staff - no other quality can be stressed as more important in administrative leadership. "He was not willing to share one inch of anyone's hide merely on suspicion".

3. Accessibility and the Open Door - always available for consultation with all employees - from the lowest to the highest. During World War II when the staff grew to large proportions, he made the statement, "It hurts not to know each of the staff as we used to".

4. Tolerance of Error - slow to judge until all the facts are in; no politicking or pitting one against another. Evaluate each on own merits.

5. Encouragement to Subordinates to Improve Themselves - agencies are not one-man shows, subordinates should be made to feel wanted; the whole climate should be conducive to improvement. Giffiths urged his employees to attend professional meetings and displayed a generous attitude toward educational leave.

These two profiles indicate that much is required to be a good administrator, especially enthusiasm, motivation, backbone, ability to stand, ability to delegate and strong motivation to do things in the right way.

Dr. Williams described his "case study" method of studying leadership as an approach pointing up "memories rather than mechanics", and testimony rather than test tubes".

IMPRESSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

(Digest)

SPEAKERS: Mr. Arnold Standing, Personnel Officer, Region 4
Mr. George Craddock, Chief, Division of Station Management, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station
Mr. Chalmer K. Lyman, Director, Division of Personnel Management, Washington Office, U. S. Forest Service

The three speakers agreed that this was a seminar of noteworthy success. Each, in his turn, expressed the opinion that this was one of the most, if not the most, interesting and fruitful seminars which he had attended. The completeness of the program agenda, the aggressiveness and excellence of the topic leadership, the high degree of participation, the inclusiveness of the recommendations and decisions, and the over-all excellence of the guest speakers were mentioned as primary reasons that the conference achieved such a high degree of success. All three speakers stressed that the objectives outlined in the cover letter accompanying the agenda, and reiterated by Mr. Hinkelman in his introductory speech, were achieved.

Mr. Standing on behalf of Region 4, Mr. Craddock on behalf of the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, and Mr. Lyman on behalf of the Washington Office, expressed their thanks and appreciation to all who made the seminar possible and who participated in the presentation.

At this time, Mr. Hinkelman expressed his thanks to the co-hosts of the seminar, Region Four and the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, and adjourned the seminar.

FIELD TRIP

(Group)

On Saturday, December 5, Region 4 and the Intermountain Station arranged a "show-me" trip to give the conferees an opportunity to view recreational developments to obtain an understanding of the amount of recreational use of some areas, and of the possible classification implication of this activity. The group observed a large picnicking area in Big Cottonwood Canyon which has had some recent improvements. They next visited Brighton, a large ski resort area, with several ski lifts. Unfortunately the snowfall had not yet been sufficient to bring the area into maximum use for winter sports. The group was able, however, to obtain an idea of the extent of use and problems involved in its administration.

On the way to these recreational areas, the group also observed the Davis County Watershed where the Forest Service has used good watershed management measures to check erosion in an important area. Also on the way the group viewed some other local points of interest.

J. William West of the Division of Personnel Management, Region 4, served as commentator on the "show-me" trip. The trip was enjoyed by all who attended.

APPENDIX

Hand-Out Material

Format for Preparing Position Descriptions (R-9)

Instructions for Preparation of Position Descriptions (R-9)

Personnel Pointers: Guide for Writing Position Descriptions for Secretarial Positions, GS-318-0 (W.O.)

Check List Description for Stenographic Duties (R-7)

Sample Position Description -- Forester (Adm.) GS-460-11

Excerpts from "How to Shorten Job Sheets" (R-7)

Classification Standards Explanatory Memorandum No. 1: Secretary Series GS-318-0 (Civil Service Commission)

Supervisory Grade Evaluation Guide, Part I (R-4)

The Role of Position Classification in the Selection of Qualified Employees (7th CSC Region)

Distribution of Responsibility for FS Classification Act Program (W.O.)

Responsibilities for Position Classification at the Operating Level (W.O.)

Distribution of Responsibility for FS Wage Administration Program (W.O.)

Grade Level Chart: Clerk-Stenographer Series GS-312-0 (R-8)

Grade Level Chart: Clerk-Typist Series GS-322-0 (R-8)

Abstract of Classification Standards for Secretary Series GS-318-0 (W.O.)

Audit Program Outline (R-6)

Desk Audit Report Form (R-8)

Classification Audit Trip Notice (R-8)

Organization List for Desk Audits (R-8)

Audit Report Follow-up Record (R-8)

Audit Recommendation Summary (R-8)

Classification Requirements under Whitten Amendment (R-8)

Outline of Proposed USDA Wage Board Manual (W.O.)

Ladder Diagram of Wage Board Jobs (R-5)

Wage Board Rates by Forest Localities in Correlation with A. AF Localities (R-5)

Proposed Guidelines for Wage Surveys and Rate Determination (W. O.)

Career Plan for F. S. Classifiers (W. O.)

Seven Phases of a Well Rounded Executive Development Program (W. O.)

Grade Distribution of USDA Employees (W. O.)

Keeping Pace in the Space Age (Second Conference Report) (W. O.)

The Management Guide-Standard Oil Company of California (W. O.)

Guide for Standard Review, Analysis and Reporting (R-4)

Forward Planning and Replacement Schedule (W. O.)

Amendment to a Position Description (R-7)

Proceedings of Workshop on Streamlining Position Classification Processes (W. O.)

Division Administrative Assistant and Chief Clerk (W. O.)

Role of Classification in Selection of Qualified Employees and Place of Performance Standards and Training Plans in Classification (W. O.)

Administrative Officers and Administrative Assistant Positions (W. O.)

Technician Concepts (W.O.)